THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In 1940 a short 'Statement of Faith' was presented to the Ninth General Council of The United Church of Canada. To Professor John Dow, M.A., D.D., of the Chair of New Testament, Emmanuel College, Victoria University, Toronto, was entrusted the honourable task of giving fuller exposition of the views of the Commission which drew up the Statement. The result appears in an attractive volume, to which many a preacher and teacher will turn with profit: *This Is Our Faith.*[1] While it expounds the short Statement section by section, it is to be taken as only reflecting, not as interpreting in detail, the Commission's views.

A similar task was undertaken for the Church of Scotland after the 'Short Statement of the Church's Faith' was issued in 1935. In 1937 a handbook to be used along with it was issued by Professor J. G. Riddell, M.A., of the Chair of Systematic Theology at the University of Glasgow and Trinity College, Glasgow. The title of the handbook is 'What We Believe.' A comparison of the two volumes should enable many readers on this side of the Atlantic better to realize what they will find in the volume now under review.

They both are expositions of Statements which are on modern conservative lines and couched so far as possible in popular language, as distinguished from the language of technical theology. They both follow the Statements faithfully, expounding them not only in their successive sections but even, within the sections, in their successive clauses. In their lucidity and balance they both show the hand of the skilled expositor.

But there appears to be one main difference. It may be expressed in terms of the difference between Systematic Theology and Biblical Theology, though in recent times the two disciplines have been drawing much closer to each other. The systematic theologian, while he must maintain contact with the Biblical basis of doctrine, is becoming less concerned with the detail of the dogmatic development; the Biblical theologian, just because nowadays the Biblical basis is not so clear as it was once thought, must give more attention to systematic distinctions. Accordingly, it is a difference not so much in theological outlook as in theological emphasis that may be discerned in the two works above named.

It may be gathered that Professor Dow's work concentrates more than does the other on the Biblical material that enters into the structure of the Christian faith. Indeed the work may be justly described as a storehouse of Biblical exposition.

The style is clear and simple, often arresting, nervous, and eloquent; and the whole work is obviously a product of loving intimacy with the Bible and diligent concern with Biblical studies.

A sentence or two from the opening paragraph may serve to give a typical example of the writer's style (and surely few expositions of the Christian faith have begun like this): 'He runs a long, long way who runs from his conscience. The self-seeking son of Isaac found that out long ago (Gn 28). He tried to cash in on his brother's rights, and had to make his heels his friends. . . . So Jacob discovered that God is One who confronts the fleeing spirit wherever he may lay his head. He outpaces our speediest feet, outdistances our swiftest thought. He is the great Spirit whose range is everywhere.'

Such is the manner of Professor Dow's approach to the Doctrine of God, and in particular to the idea of God as Spirit; and it is with similar simplicity that he opens up the other Doctrines of the Faith.

He does not provide a running commentary on each phrase of the clause under treatment. Rather is it that he selects salient phrases and expounds them with reference to their Biblical basis. The result is, however, an adequate treatment of the clause, so thoughtful and full of suggestion are the expositions.

Here is another typical utterance from the section on 'The Church': 'That timid and hunted folk should receive into their friendship an avowed enemy like Saul, that a rich man like Barnabas and many others should sell all they had and share their wealth with those who had nothing, that former revolutionaries should sit down with once orthodox and sober Pharisees and with the tax-collectors whom they had counted traitors to the national cause, that proud Jews who had always reckoned themselves a chosen

[1] Board of Evangelism and Social Service, The United Church of Canada; $1.00.

race should find themselves in a society into which were welcomed Gentiles of every nation and every class—that was proof enough that the God who called men into fellowship with Himself one by one was calling them also into fellowship with one another.'

Here is yet another typical utterance from the section on 'The Sacraments': 'It is a peculiarity of the Fourth Gospel that it has no account of the institution of the Lord's Supper. It attaches a sacramental discourse on the Bread of Life to the Feeding of the Five Thousand. It may be that the author wishes to insist that the gifts we enjoy flow from the stupendous fact that God became man in Christ Jesus, and not only from the fact of His death. Then at the point in the narrative where we expect the account of the institution of the Supper we have the story of the feet-washing, as if he wished to declare that it was only too easy to remember Jesus in a ritual act: there must be another and a deeper remembrance, a willingness to give ourselves in unstinted service to our fellow-men.'

For over twenty years now what is known as Form Criticism has had considerable vogue in the world of New Testament scholarship. It is doubtful, however, whether it has had much influence on the common Christian mind.

What is Form Criticism? In a word it is criticism directed not on the Gospel records but on the oral tradition which preceded them. Its basic assumption is that 'oral tradition circulates, not in long consecutive narratives, but in brief, rounded units, each more or less complete in itself. What Form Criticism undertakes is to get back behind the written Gospels and their sources to the oral tradition as it circulated prior to the writing down of any account of the mighty works, the sayings, the parables, or the discourses of Jesus.'

On this basic assumption it proceeds to distinguish and classify these units of tradition, arranging them in five or six main groups: anecdotes, parables, sayings, miracles, tales, and legends. Each of these types, it is held, is probably subject to certain 'laws of form' governing its oral tradition and leading to modification, expansion, and elaboration.

The acknowledged pioneer of this movement is Martin Dibelius, though the name of Rudolf Bultmann is also prominent. The most recent treatment of the subject, and by no means the least admirable, is published under the title of *The Earliest Gospel*, by the Rev. Frederick C. GRANT, D.D.[1] Dr. GRANT, who is Professor of Biblical Theology in Union Seminary, has already several books on the subject to his credit. He writes with mature scholarship, complete candour and a persuasive style. Whatever may be thought of some of his critical theories he leaves no doubt as to the fulness and fervour of his Christian faith.

[1] Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $2.50.

Form Criticism is in various ways both interesting and instructive. It reminds us that the early Christians were a vital community with minds deeply engaged upon the Christian message, that they were preachers rather than historians, supremely concerned about delivering their message of salvation to the world. There was no period when that message was simply a bare record of facts to which a Christological or soteriological meaning was afterwards attached.

But it may be doubted whether Form Criticism has an adequate appreciation of the value of historical accuracy. The preacher's temptation is to colour the facts in the interest of the moral, but the hearer is entitled to inquire, 'Are these things so? What you tell us may be very beautiful, very inspiring, but did it really happen thus?' Dr. GRANT suggests that 'perhaps the author of the earliest Gospel is best thought of as a young clerk in one of the Roman mercantile establishments, located, in the sixties of the first century, down near the Tiber, . . . and so, as one of the few in the local congregation of Christians who could both read and write, he was commissioned to put together in his spare time—probably late evenings, after the assembly of the Christians had broken up—the fragmentary translations of narratives from the story of Jesus and His teaching which were in circulation in the Roman church.' If so, what reliance can be placed upon the historical accuracy of such translated traditions of an illiterate congregation?

Similarly in speaking of John's Gospel Dr. GRANT says, 'History and interpretation have not been simply interwoven, another figure is required! They have been stirred together in a mortar, and the two elements have completely neutralized each other in a compound which is neither history nor interpretation, but mystical rhapsody and poetry of devotion, not so much a theology as a half-Gnostic Christian theosophy—history turned inside out in order to reveal its inner meaning, but ceasing to be history in the process.' Inevitably the feeling arises that in between the bedrock of historic fact and the venerable edifice of the written word Form Criticism has interposed a thick layer of shifting sand, so that it is open to doubt whether the foundation goes down to the rock at all.

Was the formation of the Christian tradition so casual, so free and uncontrolled? Form Criticism

sees it taking shape in the common Christian mind so that different varieties are found in different centres. But in the New Testament there is surely evidence of much more conscious care and effort on the part of the Apostles to transmit their message with historical accuracy. They were appointed by Christ to be His witnesses and they took their office with great seriousness. This is manifest from the fact that they proceeded at once to fill the vacant place of Judas from the number of those who had companied with Jesus from the day of John's baptism. They actively supervised the spread of the gospel, sending delegates to report on the work in Samaria and Antioch, meeting in council and giving authoritative pronouncements on questions that arose. St. Paul, for all his independence, consulted with them to make certain that they were in agreement. Time and again he solemnly declared the truth and accuracy of his message, and with touching emphasis he charges his son Timothy to 'guard the deposit.'

What was this 'deposit'? Surely something more definite than a floating tradition, a vague general consensus of Christian opinion! Surely some well-defined and authoritative word! In this connexion a very suggestive study, 'The Ministry of Mark,' by the Very Rev. R. O. P. Taylor (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, liv. 136) deserves attention. When Barnabas and Paul took Mark for their minister it is hardly to be supposed that he went merely to carry the luggage! The word used, ὑπηρέτης, is the equivalent of the Hebrew Chazzan or minister in the synagogue (Lk 4^{20}). The Chazzan was the schoolmaster and his method of education consisted in teaching the exact wording of the sacred text. It is not suggested that the Apostles would copy the rigidity of the scribes, but with their Jewish mental habits and methods of education they would have the utmost respect for the *ipsissima verba* of the Master and would give the greatest care to their accurate transmission. It would naturally suggest itself to them to train men who, after the fashion of the Chazzan, could give verbal instruction to converts, and it is a fair inference that Mark's work as 'minister' was of that sort. This is confirmed by the fact that St. Luke, in gathering and sifting the material for his Gospel, refers not only to eye-witnesses but also to those who were 'ministers of the word.' It would appear that there were men in the Apostolic Church specially instructed to teach with accuracy the gospel story, practically learning it by heart as the Jew's custom was. If so, they would be one of the most important links between the eye-witnesses and the written word, and a main support in bridging the period—short at the longest, and perhaps shorter than is often surmised—between the occurrence of the gospel events and their embodiment in writing.

A medical doctor who joined the Friends' Community has published a kind of 'confession' explaining his own personal experience, and analysing it, and the method of worship and communion by which his experiences were enriched. The little essay is called *The Quaker Meeting*,[1] and the writer is Mr. Howard E. COLLIER, M.D., Ch.B. It is not only revealing as an account of the discipline of a body too little known, but will help Christians of other persuasions to see how much all forms of worship have in common.

Dr. COLLIER begins by expounding the nature of 'religious or mystical experience.' He equates these two words; for he believes that mystical experience is the mark of a healthy, uninhibited character. There is nothing morbid in it, certainly nothing more than in any healthy rationalist. Intuitive thought, which is what the writer means by 'mystical,' plays a large part in the discovery of truth, and in support of this assertion he quotes, of all people, Bertrand Russell who says that much of the most important truth is suggested by intuitive feeling.

Dr. COLLIER thus starts his analysis with two assumptions, first that intuitive experience is normal and that the experiences of worship are developments of intuitive experience. As examples of the former he instances what may be called 'morning insight.' Sometimes a problem which seemed insoluble overnight becomes clear next morning (psychologists account for this differently). Another, and more convincing example is the sense of unity with Nature which comes to so many people overwhelmingly in the presence of the beauty or sublimity of some natural scene. Such experiences the writer holds are initiations into worship.

Just as relevant is the *participation mystique* in the herd, that is, the intuitive experiences that arise from our intercourse with our fellows. Wherever a sense of human comradeship is produced the individual tends to merge into the mass. At such times he feels, thinks, and acts intuitively or by instinct. So easily do we pass into this condition of social participation that we do not always recognize what is happening, even when the identification is complete. The writer does not illustrate this, but it may be suggested that such intuitive unity is to be seen in any excited crowd, at a political meeting or a football match.

Dr. COLLIER lays down certain conditions which must be fulfilled before intuition in its loftiest form can become active, or any form of worship

[1] Friends' House, London; 9d.

can be entered upon. One is that awareness of self must be held in abeyance. Another is that the body must be relatively quiescent, indeed that we lose consciousness of the body altogether. A third is that there must be an object other than the self towards which desire can be directed. And finally this object must be felt to be akin to the worshipper, for the experience of worship is one of a response to, and of mutual interaction between, the subject and the object.

Thus the foundation is laid. But the writer, still lingering on the threshold, insists on two important things. One is that if we go to meeting to get what we can out of it, we can be sure of getting very little. And the other is that worship, as the Quaker understands it, is not an isolated act. It is an integral part of the life of the Quaker. If that is understood, we proceed to the actual practice of worship in a Friends' meeting. Here we have two tasks. The first is to secure bodily relaxation. It is interesting that the writer insists on comfort as a preliminary to worship. Indeed he devotes an appendix to the subject. The second task is mental relaxation, the cessation of discursive thought. 'The thinking, busy soul excludes the voice of God' as one Quaker puts it. This is not an easy discipline to learn. It can be done by setting one's mind on a 'fixation point,' such as a text of Scripture, but above all on the Lord Himself.

Thus we achieve the first step in worship, meditation, or 'waiting,' or inward stillness. What follows this is 'contemplation,' or 'seeking.' The heart of the worshipper turns towards Christ with intention and with desire. It is not that we deliberately choose by ourselves the 'subject' of our contemplation. We wait for it from Christ who gives it to us. But this suggests two questions. What do we mean when we assert that Christ is the object of our contemplation? And how can we contemplate a Christ whom we have not seen?

In answer to the first question the doctor says that by 'Christ' he means to convey every meaning that can be contained within the words 'the Christ Spirit,' whether it be an experience personal or social which might be due to the divine activity. He means also all that is conveyed by the historic Christ or the eternal Christ. In answer to the second question the doctor says that if the word Christ has only an indefinite meaning to you, you should choose whatever or whoever you have known as the Best and make that the 'fixation-point'; you will soon find that your 'Best' is gradually transformed into a true image of Christ. Perhaps you will awaken suddenly to the great Reality and be able to say 'my Lord and my God.'

When we are thus 'seeking,' the Word will come to us from Christ. Frequently it is one of personal guidance. But more usually the Word comes through the spoken words of some other member of the group. It is thus important to attend to spoken messages given in the meeting, and especially to resist the tendency to listen critically with the ear of reason. Rather learn to listen appreciatively, trying to feel after the hidden sense of the message, seeking to discover the significance of the message for yourself. It almost always happens that some phrase or picture will light up truth for you and sink into the unconscious, to produce its fruit in due time.

Hitherto the writer has had the individual chiefly in view. But at this point he proceeds to deal with the experience of becoming an integral part of a worshipping group. The real good of the meeting comes when the sense of unity is achieved and the 'I' begins to feel as 'we.' As this sense grows, each one seeks to enter into communion with his fellows, to sense the nature of the spirit that animates them, to perceive their needs and share their burdens. Little by little the weight of our own personal cares and anxieties is insensibly lifted from our own shoulders. It seems, in literal truth, as if the group as a whole had taken upon its broad shoulders the burdens of the individual. It is here, says Dr. Collier, in this new unit of life among the Friends of Christ, that is to be found that integrated group of men and women for which the world is in travail and through which the world's problems can be solved.

'I hope I shall not be thought to be disrespectful to the early Christian Church,' concludes Dr. Collier, 'if I say that in strict measure, similar experiences to those recorded in Acts are still enjoyed in some Friends' Meetings. It seems to me possible that the physical basis of the events there recorded, was a sudden sharp storm of wind and rain which shook the house and passed almost as suddenly as it came. Then as the cloud passed from before the face of the sun, bright shafts of sunlight lit up the meeting room and appeared to some at least of the worshippers as tongues of fire playing upon and around the bent heads of the others.'

'It is evident that the whole meeting was profoundly moved and in a state of spiritual exaltation. First, we read that they were met in unity with one accord. Secondly, the rushing wind has always been a symbol of divine inspiration and the flame a symbol of divine illumination: so we read they spoke as the spirit gave them utterance. Have we not, in measure, experienced all these things in meeting?'

Cults of To-day.

VII. Jehovah's Witnesses.

By Canon J. M. Swift, M.A., Garston, Liverpool.

In 1872 'a few Christian persons met together in a little town in Pennsylvania to consider the Scriptures relative to the Coming of Christ Jesus and His Kingdom.' From that prosaic meeting there was to spring one of the most aggressive and widespread sects of modern times—Jehovah's Witnesses.

Since its formation the organization has been known by various names — Russellites, Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, International Bible Students' Association Incorporated, and more recently, Jehovah's Witnesses.

The sect has always followed its leader with fanatical loyalty, regarding his written interpretations of Holy Scripture as infallible. An American writer, commenting on the sect's blind acceptance of their leader's exegesis, says, 'His words are not accepted as the Law and the Prophets. They are accepted as more than that. The Witnesses rely on what the Bible says, but they count on "Judge" Rutherford to tell them what it means by what it says. The latter rôle is obviously more important.'

It is necessary, therefore, to examine the records of the two men who until 1942 presided over the rising fortunes of this remarkable cult. The founder who called together 'a few Christian persons' in 1872 was Charles Taze Russell. He was a draper in Pittsburg. His business prospering, Russell was able to devote an increasing amount of time to local preaching, and then to writing commentaries on portions of Holy Scripture. By juggling with the length of years of the patriarchs, the reigns of the Kings and Judges and some dates from the New Testament Russell concluded that the Second Advent had already occurred in 1874. He had to acknowledge that it was an invisible Advent. Soon Russell ranged over a wide field of Biblical exegesis and his books, hawked from door to door by his agents, were bought in incredible numbers by an astonished and uncritical public. Russell assumed the title of 'Pastor' and his name became known throughout the United States. Russell was a shrewd man of affairs and he dabbled in other business besides religious book publishing. One of his ventures, the sale of what was known as 'miracle wheat,' drew forth some outspoken criticism from the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*. He sued the paper for 100,000 dollars damages in October 1911, but lost the case. The 'Pastor' was involved in many legal actions, including one which his wife brought against him. She gained a divorce, the Court holding that Russell's 'continual domination and insistent egoism were such as to render the life of any Christian woman a burden and make her life intolerable.' The verdict was appealed against five times by Russell, but was always upheld.

When Russell died in 1916 his organization recorded that 'When the history of the Church of Christ is fully written it will be found that the place next to St. Paul in the gallery of fame as expounder of the Gospel of the Great Master will be occupied by Charles Taze Russell.' Such extravagant praise is the more remarkable when it is remembered that Russell's prophecy of the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth had been falsified in 1914. But because Russell had pitched upon 1914 as the year of momentous consequences his followers often boast that the outbreak in that year of the Great War was a proof that their leader was Divinely inspired. What they omit to state is that Russell had repeatedly prophesied that 1914 was to mark the end of the times of tribulation, not the beginning. Russell's words were: 'We consider it an established truth that the final end of the kingdoms of this world and the full establishment of the Kingdom of God will be accomplished at the close of A.D. 1914'; or again: 'With the end of A.D. 1914 what God calls Babylon, and what men call Christendom, will have passed away, as already shown from prophecy.'

Following the loss of such a leader it seemed doubtful whether the sect could survive. But there boldly stepped into the place of 'Pastor' Russell a lawyer named Joseph Franklyn Rutherford. He had defended Russell on many of his appearances in Court and had an intimate knowledge of the business side of Russell's organization. Rutherford had already tried his hand at producing the kind of literature beloved of Russell's followers. Shortly before the Pastor's death Rutherford wrote a pamphlet of some fifty pages entitled *A Great Battle in the Ecclesiastical Heavens, as Seen by a Lawyer*. The author acclaimed 'Pastor' Russell as 'the greatest living Bible student' and also 'the greatest living preacher.' Rutherford

thus qualified to follow his friend, but the succession caused violent dissension within the organization, and it was not without some misgivings on the part of the older members of the sect that Rutherford finally established his position. I have met ardent disciples of 'Pastor' Russell who do not subscribe to the teachings of J. F. Rutherford and are critical of some of the present day methods of Jehovah's Witnesses, which they think are contrary to the teaching of the founder. Rutherford, however, was soon securely in the saddle. He was known to his followers as 'the Judge,' a title which undoubtedly added to his prestige amongst the masses. Actually the title was less justified than the one adopted by Charles Taze Russell. Dom Richard Felix, a Benedictine, who hails from Rutherford's native State, has published his discoveries, which are embodied in a pamphlet, *Judge Rutherford*, written by the Rev. H. Thurston, S.J. Rutherford never received any official appointment as a judge. 'It is seemingly the custom in Missouri that when the properly appointed court president is away from home on circuit, it falls to one or other member of the local bar to replace him in hearing minor causes. In this sense Rutherford acted as temporary judge on four occasions, each for one day only, and it happened on two of these four days that no case came before the court.'

Prior to his becoming head of Russell's great organization, Rutherford had had a somewhat stormy career. Things reached a climax when America entered the first World War. Rutherford violently denounced American participation and in such a manner that in 1918, together with six members of the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, he was sentenced to twenty years' penal servitude for 'unlawfully and wilfully conspiring to cause insubordination, disloyalty and refusal of duty in the military and naval forces of the United States.' They all served nine months of their sentence in the Federal Prison at Atlanta, Georgia, but were released in May 1919.

One of the best informed articles about the organization appeared in the well-known American publication, *The Saturday Evening Post* of 14th September 1940. In this the writer says that it was generally assumed by the public that after his imprisonment, Rutherford would lose his influence and his cause would languish. Quite the opposite happened; he had skirted the fringe of martyrdom, and, snatched back, he was acclaimed. Under the new leadership, Russell became less of a name to conjure with and the old title, The Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, was gradually supplanted by the now familiar designation, Jehovah's Witnesses.

Rutherford wrote: 'Those who are properly called Jehovah's Witnesses are not religionists, for the reason they do not practise religion. They do not compose a sect or a denomination. . . . A religionist is not a witness for Jehovah, for the reason that religion is against God.' Rutherford was undoubtedly a man of ability, a shrewd judge of the popular mind and a master of propaganda. His great mass meetings were most skilfully organized. Addressing himself to the sect's basic teaching about the imminence of the Second Coming, Rutherford was smarter and more guarded than Russell. To quote *The Saturday Evening Post*: 'Russell set definite dates for the "Coming." When, on each successive occasion, the event failed to materialize he was driven back to his pencil and paper to show to his somewhat shaken following that he had miscalculated. Rutherford does not go in for times and seasons. The nearest he comes to the calendar is in such phrases as "soon," "at hand," "not long delayed."'

Rutherford insisted, however, that Christ returned invisibly to earth in 1914. He taught that Armageddon is at hand, when Jehovah will reign. The Judgment will follow, the wicked will be destroyed and the saved will serve in Jehovah's kingdom to be set up on earth. This is called the Theocratic Kingdom. Associated with this teaching is the Witnesses' slogan, 'Millions Now Living Will Never Die.' The Witnesses make great play with Rev 7^4: 'And there were sealed an hundred and forty and four thousand of all the tribes of the children of Israel.' To formulate an important doctrine on a single verse of scripture is always unwise, especially when other passages may be quoted in a contrary sense. Moreover, Biblical students know the difficulty of interpreting Apocalyptic literature such as Revelation and Daniel, which is also a favourite textual hunting ground of the Witnesses. Probably more false teaching has been built on Rev 7^4 than on any other text in the Bible. 'Judge' Rutherford's interpretation, to be found in *Deliverance*, p. 271, is: 'Of the overcoming class who have the promise of being for ever with the Lord, there will be only 144,000, and doubtless the major portion of these has already passed into glory, while the minority remain on earth waiting for the consummation of their hopes.' The same teaching is given more directly in 'Consolation, a Journal of Fact, Hope, and Courage,' of the 8th July 1942: 'Who gains the kingdom? Only 144,001 will ever get to heaven at all.' On inquiry I was informed that the extra one was our Lord Himself. Readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will be aware that the number 12 was the Hebrew symbol of completeness and that the repeated 'were sealed 12,000' had an added ring of triumph for the Jew. Like a

series of huge regiments God's people march by, receive the sign of His favour, and pass into the distance. Thus the true interpretation of the passage is opposed to the suggestion that only 144,000 are to be saved. On the contrary, every member of every tribe is 'sealed' or capable of salvation. In spite of the plain statements quoted from the Witnesses' own literature, members of the sect when challenged about the few who are to be saved often attempt to make a distinction between those who are 'round the throne' and the unspecified number who will be only 'round about'! Elsewhere they teach that mankind is divided into two sections—the overwhelming number of people belong to 'Satan's organization'; the exclusive 144,000 to 'the overcoming class.'

Attempts to discover their full teaching is not easy and discussion with the Witnesses is seldom profitable. They remind one of Humpty Dumpty: 'When I use a word it means just what I choose it to mean; neither more nor less.' They give to 'religion' a meaning peculiarly their own and attempt to distinguish between religion and Christianity. Orthodox Christians and members of the Church are 'religionists.' The Witnesses say: 'Religion's doom is at hand,' and 'Religion is a racket.' Yet, they appear before Conscientious Objectors' Tribunals and claim exemption as 'Ministers of Religion.' They claim to be Christians, but on p. 91 of *Deliverance* we are told that 'the greatest demonstration of hypocrisy that has ever been on earth . . . parades under the title of Christendom.'

The Witnesses deny the Divinity of Christ, the Holy Trinity, and the Resurrection of Christ as taught by the Christian Church. For example: 'Jesus was a perfect man, nothing more, nothing less.' 'The Holy Spirit is not a person and is therefore not one of the Gods of the Trinity.' 'The clergy, who have taught, and yet teach the trinity and incarnation dogmas refuse to hear and obey the truth.' Capital letters are omitted in unexpected places. Much abuse is poured on 'the Trinitarians.' 'The clergy say: "Jesus was his own father." They do not tell the truth.' 'Christ Jesus the divine was born three days after the crucifixion.' The clergy and organized religion are the object of vicious attacks. Clergymen are described as 'enemies of God.' The following passage appears in *Reconciliation* (by J. F. Rutherford), p. 71. 'When the people study the Word of God for themselves and find the simplicity and beauty thereof they can see what great hypocrites are the clergymen. But these clergymen have kept the people in ignorance of the Bible. They refuse to teach the people themselves what the Bible says: they turn the mind of the people away from the Bible and warn them to read nothing concerning the Bible that does not come from the pen of one of these pious hypocrites.'

Toleration of other people's religious views is scorned by the Witnesses. When I complained about their attitude to orthodox Christians and pointed out that their attacks were hardly consistent with Christian profession I received the naïve reply: 'Did Jesus hate iniquity?' In other words, what is not taught by Russell and Rutherford is iniquitous and must be attacked with impunity.

Here we are primarily concerned with the religious aspect of the sect. But something must be said of the political implications of the organization, seeing that the man in the street thinks of the Witnesses as a religious organization and he has been much annoyed by their attitude to the war. Their strong pacifism has attracted many new members. Judge Burgis openly referred to 'that unfortunately large body who join this organization as a means of evading military service.' The Witnesses deny that the organization is pacifist. Again they employ a word as they wish and contrary to its common use. They say they will fight only for Jehovah and His people—in other words, for their own cherished beliefs. I possess an American periodical in which there is a picture of a young man whose head 'was bashed by Witnesses' canes in a riot.' Another illustration shows a number of tough-looking Witnesses armed with sticks to bar 'the over-curious from the business offices at the Detroit Convention.' The Witnesses have a conscientious objection to taking arms against the Nazis, but none apparently against fighting their fellow countrymen. They refuse to take part in public affairs, to vote at elections or to hold any public office. The only citizenship which they acknowledge is a heavenly one. They thrive on opposition and what they are pleased to call 'persecution.' The American writer previously quoted says of their activities in the United States, where the organization is very powerful, 'Defiance of what others cherish and revere is their daily meat. They hate all religions and say so from the housetops. They hate all governments with an enthusiasm which is equally unconcealed . . . for being generally offensive they have been getting their heads cracked, their meetings broken up, their meeting-houses pillaged and themselves thrown into jail. . . . Before this rising wave of ill will they never retreat. On the contrary—fortified by the Scriptures—they welcome it.'

When the organization was banned in New Zealand in 1940 the Attorney General said that the Witnesses had come under disfavour 'because for some time their propaganda appeared to be wholly devoted to vilification of religion, their

fellow citizens, the State and the Government.' They were banned in Australia a few months later. Much public anger and suspicion have been aroused in this country by some of the references to Britain and America in writings of the Witnesses. One of 'Judge' Rutherford's books, *Light*, discovers in Revelation many references to the British Empire and the Anglo-American alliance. The British Empire is said to be the seat of Satan's 'beastly organization.' 'British diplomacy is the last word in deceptiveness.' 'The beast is Satan's organization on earth, manifested particularly in the seventh head thereof, to wit, the seventh world power, which is Great Britain.' 'The British-American two-horned animal boasts that the sun never sets on its domains. . . . Thus, like a frog, it makes much noise and out of its mouth comes that which indicates the beast condition.'

One of Mr. Rutherford's most striking utterances, made at a great mass meeting in the Albert Hall in 1938, prophesied the destruction of the British Empire by the Nazis and Fascists. That this was not lightly spoken and afterwards regretted is shown by the recalling of the remark in a publication, *Judge Rutherford Uncovers Fifth Column*, issued at a time when it appeared possible that Britain would be invaded. On p. 15 of this pamphlet it is stated, 'At a public address in London, which was transmitted throughout the British Empire, and was delivered in 1938, I stated that the Nazis and Fascists were bent upon destroying the British Empire, and that that would be accomplished.'

The Witnesses complain of 'persecution,' but many people, including Members of Parliament, feel that they have been given an excessive amount of freedom to carry on their activities and that they have abused the toleration afforded their 'religious views.' In their *Official Year Book* the Witnesses admit that in a period of three months they 'imported under government licence 189 tons of books and booklets and magazines as well as some recordings.' During one year they claim to have printed in this country 3,026,543 booklets and 46,500 bound books. It was not until November 1942 that a ban was placed on the importation of certain of the Society's publications from America. About the same time Mr. H. G. Schroeder, the leader of the Witnesses in this country, was ordered to be deported. This the Witnesses complain is 'persecution.' But the British Government has resisted pressure in Parliament to ban the organization, not wishing apparently to be accused of religious intolerance.

Jehovah's Witnesses share the beliefs of many other Adventist sects and exhibit the same enthusiastic longing for our Lord's return. They differ from other sects in their aggressive propaganda. Every Jehovah's Witness is a missionary and deems it his or her duty to lead orthodox Christians to the Truth as they conceive it, and as 'Judge' Rutherford has taught it. One cannot but admire their persistence and sacrifice. Elderly members of the organization stand for hours in busy thoroughfares and in all weathers selling Rutherford's writings. Others go from door to door in an effort to sell their books and to make converts. One observes in the movement a strange blending of religious zeal and business opportunism. Their 'full-time ministers' say they receive merely their expenses and a nominal sum for pocket money, but the organization is very wealthy if we may judge from the property it owns and rents and the large number of full-time agents it employs. In the United States it possesses palatial headquarters. The Witnesses, however, are not communicative about their income. Judge Frankland drew attention to this when he said: 'I have been trying for a fortnight to draw your headquarters to get them to send a balance sheet.' Nor will they reveal how their full-time workers are supported. Although the Witnesses hold aloof from everyday affairs, they do not hesitate to invoke the law when it suits their purpose, and they have threatened several clergymen with libel actions.

'Jehovah's Witnesses' has less in common with orthodox Christianity than most heresies. It is aggressively hostile to Catholic Christianity and all forms of organized religion. To instructed members of the Christian Church it is never likely to make the least appeal, nor will its fantastic interpretations of Holy Scripture cause anything but amusement or disgust to Biblical scholars. The progress of the sect is proof of the ignorance of many professing Christians about the fundamental doctrines of their faith. It proves also how easily impressed is a certain type of mind with a show of Biblical knowledge which rests upon the ready quotation of texts and the self assurance of the commentator. Add to this the thrill of believing that one belongs to the 'Overcoming Class,' a spiritual Herrenvolk, and that 'persecution' by one's fellows is a proof of likeness to Christ, for He was similarly treated, and one realizes why members of the organization do not shrink from, even if they do not invite, opposition. The best way to counter the many absurd doctrines of the Witnesses is by sound teaching of the Fundamentals of the Faith and careful exegesis of the Bible, not omitting the Apocalyptic books.

Literature.

EVELYN UNDERHILL.

The Letters of Evelyn Underhill, with an introduction by Mr. Charles Williams (Longmans: 10s. 6d. net). This book is a precious possession for all who have received help and inspiration from the writings of one who was a great saint and a great human being. Mr. Williams gives us a sufficient account of the outward events in her career and some indication of her religious development, and these are carried into detail in the letters which form the main body of the book.

What has always impressed me about Miss Underhill was the equal balance in her nature of devotion and practical sense. She lived in two worlds, and they were equally real. Her first book was one of humorous verse and some of her letters sparkle with wit. To one of her correspondents, who tended to be rather 'high-falutin,' she writes: 'Hot milk and a thoroughly foolish novel are better things for you to go to bed on just now than St. Teresa.' And she could condescend to the language of ordinary people on the domestic plane: 'My own darling boy' is how she begins a letter to her husband, Mr. Herbert Stuart Moore.

But of course it is the spiritual side of her nature and achievement that has been chiefly presented to the world in her books. One of her greatest books is the treatise on mysticism, and she would contend, I think, with the Quakers that mysticism is a normal thing in human beings. She found God in the material world everywhere. She called it the veil through which we see the Divine. And then she went on to say that this received its final sanction in the Incarnation of Christ. That is the contention also of Canon Raven's last book, a really great book, 'Good News of God.' Curiously enough she held with the Quakers also that to realize God we must find bodily ease, so much ease that we forget our bodies altogether. And she practised, and advised, the same technique as the Quakers for laying open the soul to the entrance of the Word.

She was also a Catholic, not a Roman, though she came near to the Roman Church at one time. She was a convinced Anglican of the Catholic persuasion, and sets down in one letter what are 'the keys of the Catholic position.' These are, first, the Incarnation, and second, a mystical continuation of the Incarnation in the Sacraments. There does not seem to be anything denominational in this statement, for all convinced Christians hold the same things. But then all convinced Christians are Catholics. What probably divided her from her Evangelical brethren was that she had discovered the Church, and the Church as the Body of Christ held a large place in her creed and practice.

Two things that appear in this book come with rather a surprise. One is that in her nature two opposing forces were always at work, devotion and scepticism. Mr. Williams speaks of 'the equal (or all but equal) swaying level' of these two. Apparently Miss Underhill had 'the temperament of doubt' yoked with her deep religious instinct. The other surprising thing is that for a good long time her religion was theocentric. Christ and the New Testament meant very little to her. It was largely due to the influence of Von Hügel that the centre of her faith passed to the gospel and to the person of Christ.

It ought not to be forgotten in anything one says of Miss Underhill that her vocation in life came to be direction. Many of these letters are letters of guidance to disciples, and these will be read with much profit for their practical help as well as for their religious inspiration. Of all such letters it should be said that the director never attempted to dominate or mould her devotees. All her efforts were to help them to realize themselves and find their own way to peace and power.

F. J. Rae.

PROBLEMS OF WORSHIP.

The Deans of St. Paul's and Liverpool, feeling the need of a scrutiny of the facilities provided for public prayer at the present day, propose to edit a series of small books on worship written by members of various churches, in which such subjects as the nature of worship, the drafting of services, the provision of music, and the fabric and the furnishing of places of worship will be considered.

The first of the series, *English Prayer Books* (Cambridge University Press; 6s. net), is an introduction to the literature of Christian public worship, and ranges from apostolic times to the present century. The author, Mr. Stanley Morison, was asked to describe the origin and development of the existing service-books normally used to-day in the churches of England. He has performed his task with thoroughness and unusual competence. One could hardly look for a more learned or scholarly compilation within the limits of such a series. And the author's claim will readily be granted that in this book he has considered liturgical works dispassionately, and purely from the bibliographical point of view, 'as documents on the practice of religion by the English destined, let us say, for inclusion in the library of an institute of historical studies.'

At one place he glances across the Border and takes note of the 'Book of Common Order 1928 for Use in Services and Offices of the United Free Church (of Scotland).' But he has not taken cognisance of the work issued in 1940 by authority of the General Assembly of the united Church, 'Book of Common Order of the Church of Scotland' (perpetuating the title of John Knox's Liturgy of 1561).

As a specimen of the style of the book under review let us take the following: 'The most recent example of fine Anglican liturgical typography is *The Order of Solemn Entrance*, i.e., for the opening

of the Nave of Liverpool Cathedral in 1941, printed at Cambridge. The *editio maior* of this Rite is a demy folio, printed correctly in red and black and employing magnificent large initials to distinguish the several most solemn portions of the service. The production may take rank as one of the finest pieces of liturgical printing for the Church of England executed in this country and is comparable with the first edition of Mr. Newdigate's and Mr. Francis Meynell's *Ritus Servandus* in 1912.'

Appended to the book are two very interesting 'Vocational Services.' The first is a Service for Officers and Men of the Royal Navy, in which the 'mainstay' is what was said and sung by men with experience of the ships and the sea. The other is a Jubilee Service for the Royal Air Force, drafted by a number of the men of the Fighter and Bomber Commands, and held in connexion with the twenty-fifth anniversary of that new fighting arm. It is Mr. Stanley Morison's hope that such special Services, which have already renewed the appeal of liturgical forms to many, may be extended to symbolize also social and national recognition of the trades of peace.

W. FULTON.

A delightful little book of devotion has been composed by Miss Georgia Harkness and issued through the Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York —*The Glory of God* ($1.00). It consists in equal parts of poems and prayers, fifty of each. There are poems of Assurance and Aspiration, Nature poems and hymns. And there are general prayers for worship, personal and corporate, prayers for special occasions and needs, and prayers for particular groups, for wives and mothers, business women, for husbands, students and teachers, for soldiers and sailors and so on. We have tested both parts and cordially commend this admirable devotional guide, admirable in spirit and in achievement. As a companion for a quiet hour it will be welcome and will richly reward any one who uses it.

Guardian of the Law, by Mr. Philip Paneth (Alliance Press; 5s. net), is a record of the public life and activities of the Chief Rabbi, Dr. J. H. Hertz. It will be generally acknowledged that Dr. Hertz by his moral and religious leadership, by his political wisdom and influence, has a record of service to his own people and to the cause of human well-being which deserves to be held in honourable remembrance. For that reason this book is of value as well as for the information it gives about the present tragedy of the Jewish race. It would perhaps have been more effective, however, if it had been less purely eulogistic. It is written from the viewpoint of orthodox Judaism and strict Zionism with contempt for missions and no allowance for the complexity of the Palestinian problem. None the less the writer succeeds in painting the picture of a wise and good man, full of courage and insight, giving guidance and heartening to his sorely tried people.

In This Sign We Conquer (Carey Press; 1s. net) contains a series of ten 'outline studies for the use of women's groups.' These studies are missionary in character and are arranged in five sets of two. The first of each pair deals with the character and life of some notable figure, for example, Kagawa, Madame Chiang, etc., and is followed by a suitable Scriptural topic. The descriptive work is well done and the questions for discussion are apposite and suggestive.

There are many denominations for which the doctrine of the Church is a dead letter. The emphasis on individual salvation has obscured what occupies a large part of the New Testament. And wherever this happens a serious loss follows. It is therefore pleasant to find a clergyman taking the Church as the subject of a whole course of teaching for his Bible Class. These lessons have been published under the title *Concerning Christ and the Church* (Church of Scotland Committee on Publications; 2s. net), and the author, the Rev. John Howat, B.D., has dealt with his subject in a thorough fashion, giving careful treatment not only to the main theme but also to the Bible, the Christian gospel, Christian unity, and other cognate topics. This is a useful and necessary piece of work and it has been well done.

There is a good deal that is interesting and valuable in *The Bible: Its Letter and Spirit*, by Mr. William C. Dick, M.A., F.E.I.S., Emeritus Headmaster under Glasgow Education Authority (Dent; 7s. 6d. net). It will inform the general reader on points like the critical analysis of the Pentateuch and the history and origin of the English Versions; and throughout the book there is a mass of information of all kinds that the same reader will find novel and acceptable. But the main purpose of the book is to show that there is a spiritual sense within the letter. 'All that the Lord speaks, not merely what is cast in the literary form of parable, but all the Word of the Lord of the Old Testament as well as of the New is marked by this Divine characteristic which no human authorship can claim—an internal spiritual sense, spirit and life, directly applicable to the spiritual nature of man and concerned only with things of the spirit.' Mr. Dick is a disciple of Swedenborg, and has learned this lesson from his master. It is of course opposed to the principle on which all modern treatment of the Bible is based, namely that there is a definite historic sense in every Biblical passage, and that our duty is to find this and receive it as the message of that passage, however we may *apply* it to modern situations. But, though the modern reader will find himself at variance with the author of this book on its main contention, he will learn a great deal from the serious and well-informed chapters in which the author states his thesis.

A singularly fresh book comes from New Zealand, *Live and Move*, by Rev. Leonard C. Horwood (Epworth Press; 6s. net). It is described by the author as 'just an attempt to give simple answer, expressed in ordinary language,

to the age-old questions—What is the right life? Who is the good man?' It consists of eleven addresses or essays on such topics as A Man should Think, Work, Pray, Love, etc. In its vivid style, its original turns of expression, its fertile imagination, its happy illustrations and its warm evangelical spirit, it makes fascinating reading and is a spiritual tonic. Its main theme is to commend Christ and the Christian way to a bewildered generation called to live in a difficult age.

Protestant Sacramentalism (Independent Press; 6d.), by the Rev. Arthur Halfpenny, M.A., is a well-written essay or address in which the Protestant view of the Lord's Supper is distinguished from the Roman Catholic view, and the plea made that Protestantism has gone too far in abolishing the 'altar.' If we may place a table in church in symbol of spiritual communion, why not place an altar in church to symbolize sacrificial love? The altar is 'an outward and visible sign both of the altar in the heart of God and of the altar in the heart of every true believer.'

The Rev. G. Campbell Morgan, D.D., has added another to his many volumes of Biblical exposition. *The Parables and Metaphors of Our Lord* (Marshall, Morgan, & Scott; 12s. 6d. net) covers a very wide field. It not only gives a full treatment of all the parables as recorded in the Gospels but it also deals more briefly, yet adequately, with what may be called 'parabolic illustrations.' Of these latter Dr. Morgan enumerates no fewer than forty-nine in the Sermon on the Mount alone, though not all are discussed. The book, which contains sixty-three lectures, is a rich mine of gospel teaching. The writer's method of exposition is too well known to need description, but we are again astonished and edified by his profound knowledge of Scripture and his skill in bringing one passage to bear on the elucidation of another. Critical questions are hardly touched on and illustrations from literature are few, but every lecture is rich in spiritual food and for the working preacher there is here a wealth of material.

Some time ago two volumes were published containing questions put by members of a Bible Class and the answers given by all sorts of really prominent and able men. The Radio Padre, the Rev. R. Selby Wright, has adopted this idea for his own particular use. He gives us in a book, *Soldiers Also Asked* (Milford; 4s. 6d. net), a group of twenty-two questions and the answers by as eminent men as we found in the previous books. Among the eminent are the Very Rev. Dr. D. S. Cairns, Professor Taylor of Edinburgh University, the present Archbishop of Canterbury, the Dean of Durham (Dr. Alington), the Headmaster of Rugby, the Dean of Exeter (Dr. S. C. Carpenter), the Dean of St. Paul's (Dr. W. R. Matthews), the Right Rev. Dr. John Baillie, Dr. F. A. Cockin (Canon of St. Paul's), Dr. Edwyn Bevan, the Rev. W. H. Elliott, Professor W. R. Forrester of St. Andrew's University, Dr. J. W. Coutts, and the Rev. David Cairns, C.F.

It turns out that soldiers ask very much the same questions as Bible Class pupils: Who is God? Is God Almighty? Why does God allow War? Why doesn't the Church practise what it preaches? Why do Chaplains counsel others to fight when they don't fight themselves? (this is a new one), What do we know about life after death? Do you really believe all that is in the Bible?, and so on.

The answers are in general sound and helpful. And the book contains on the whole a body of popular divinity which does as much as anything so unsystematic could do to shed light on dark places. Some of the great ones try to be simple, and others pay the anxious inquirer a compliment by filling some seven or eight pages with an elaborate argument.

The Master of Time (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 6d. net), by Mr. Max Warren, a Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, consists of three devotional studies (Contemplation, Meditation, Aspiration) of the incident of the Upper Room. The thread running through them is Professor Alexander's aphorism, 'Incompleteness of any moment is of the essence of Time.' And the message in which they culminate is that we should treat Time sacramentally—'live, that is, sacramentally in Time, conscious that in the Nowness of everyday God is directly coming into human life through the things that happen to us and the things we do.' The studies are thoughtful and couched in simple terms.

Those who read 'The Way of a Pilgrim,' published in 1930 and already regarded as something of a devotional classic, will welcome a successor, *The Pilgrim Continues His Way*, translated from the Russian by R. M. French (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). It is a quaint and fascinating spiritual narrative of one who in 'the way' met with many curious and interesting people. A large part of the little book is taken up with discussions on the Christian faith, but these take place in an atmosphere which presents them from a novel angle. The map of the pilgrim's journey at the beginning is of special interest because it is a map of the whole country over which Russia and Germany are at present contending. Kiev is the centre of the district. This is an out-of-the-way book. Try it.

Canon F. B. Macnutt, who is Canon of Canterbury and Chaplain to the King, has written a little book on *Four Freedoms, Atlantic and Christian* (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 6d. net). He takes the four freedoms of the Atlantic Charter, freedom from want and fear, freedom of speech and worship, and tests them by reference to the Gospels. No doubt many people feel the subject somewhat threadbare, but it is all-important, and it is handled here in a fresh and interesting manner. The Canon's message in this little book will bring light and stimulus to all who read it.

A Failure of Idiom.

By the Reverend George W. H. Loudon, B.D., S.T.M., C.F.

Every family has its own set of catch-phrases, which hold little meaning for the outsider; and in like fashion every social group has its own idioms, which may have little or no significance for those outwith the group. An example, on the largest possible scale, of this kind of lack of significance is indicated by Bernard Shaw's description of Great Britain and the United States as two countries separated by a common language; and the resulting confusion and misunderstanding may be fairly described as a failure of idiom. There are, of course, times when such a failure is a relatively unimportant thing. But when the main purpose of the group employing the idiom is to spread the knowledge of its teachings among men, then clearly it is of first importance that that idiom should be a widely-comprehended thing; and everything that would restrict such comprehension is an offence against the group itself. It is the contention of the present essay that just such an offence is being daily committed against the Church of Christ; and that those who commit it are precisely those to whom the task of teaching the Christian faith has been entrusted. There has been here an immense failure of idiom; resulting in a separation fully as great as that referred to in the Shavian epigram. You may call it the separation between Church and Market-place; you may call it the separation between Pulpit and Pew. Both forms exist, and each has its own contribution to make of hindrance and misunderstanding. Failure to bridge the former of these gulfs is the reason that so many to-day look on religion as a thing that is just irrelevant—something you can safely leave out of the reckoning; failure to bridge the second gulf is the reason of our finding so many devout believers who have never been brought beyond the stage of babes in Christ.

I.

No doubt much of this has been said before. The non-relevance of religion is a favourite theme. But it is my impression that alike in describing and in trying to cope with the problem one point has been overlooked, and it is to that point that I would, in what may seem a rather roundabout way, draw attention. And as a first step, let us look more closely at the situation which the last sentence of the preceding paragraph describes.

Dr. Whale has described our universe as one in which ', . . things exist only in relation to all other things; and where, according to the physicists, the most distant star is disturbed every time my son throws his teddy-bear out of his pram' (*Christian Doctrine*, 124). Despite the first part of that statement, it is probable that the average man will continue to feel that the 'most distant star,' if in any way it is related to his life, is only a very distant relative; whose existence it is quite permissible to forget, except perhaps once or twice in the year. And it would appear that concerning religion much the same holds good. If it is there, well, there it is; but whether it is there or not doesn't really make much odds. It is, in fact, 'a *most distant* star'; it is not the 'Sun of our souls.' Faced with the question which the poet puts on the lips of Bishop Blougram:

> Like you this Christianity or not?
> It may be false, but will you wish it true?
> Has it your vote . . .?

—faced with that question, there are many to-day who do not even trouble to visit the polling-booth.

It is sometimes said that the reason for this attitude is to be found in the fact that people are not as religious as they used to be; an ambiguous phrase which does not throw much light on the problem. If it means that the religious people of to-day do not bear comparison with their predecessors—that the Christians of to-day are less Christian than were their Christian grandfathers—then it is a judgment of very doubtful validity. If, on the other hand, it means that there are fewer people interested in religion than there used to be, it is not an explanation of our problem, but a restatement of it. Yet it may be helpful to this extent, that it will remind us that people normally are interested in things whose meaning they can grasp; and if the meaning be lacking, then their interest also will be evanescent. But meaning is expressed in language; and the lack of interest may be due, and in my judgment is very largely due, to a failure to understand the language which religion speaks.

That is not intended as an attack upon the language of the Bible, or, for that matter, of the Creeds; it is meant as a criticism of the language in which these are commonly 'interpreted.' No doubt Biblical and credal expressions are often unintelligible to the average man to-day; but it is, I think, of more immediate importance to realize that the so-called explanations, or interpretations, of these expressions are often just as

incomprehensible to the majority. These, just as much as the originals they represent, are idioms; and they are idioms which have failed of their purpose.

This failure is of course easily discernible in the case of the first gulf referred to in the introductory section. But not there alone, but also in the case of the second gulf—the gulf between Pulpit and Pew—the failure can be shown to exist. In this case, it is true, the task is not one of introducing something new to the mind, but of clarifying and enriching thoughts and beliefs which are already there. Yet how often is that task successfully carried out? Let the reader ask himself in how many of the church-folk of his acquaintance he can discern any signs of such success; and though the answer may vary with the experience of the individual, yet on the average it will be found that the percentage of church people in whom that task has been carried out is an alarmingly small one. It is an old story, for a new reason. 'The hungry sheep look up and are not fed': not for any want of virtue in their pastors (this is hardly an age to encourage any man to enter the ministry 'for his belly's sake') but for a want of technique in these same pastors. That want of technique consists in the failure of the idiom; the inability to realize that we—the pastors—are speaking in a language which our flocks do not understand.

II.

'In religion things are presented to the senses, or ideas presented to the mind, which purport, not to call to mind other things within the experience of the worshipper, but to convey to him knowledge of things beyond the range of any human experience . . . something (is) chosen within the worshipper's experience to tell him about something lying outside his experience.' (Bevan, *Symbolism and Belief*, 14.) If we give that statement a more general reference than is indicated by the word 'worshipper,' we shall find a fairly clear expression of what our problem is and what our task must be. We have to deal with things beyond ordinary experience; we have to convey some knowledge of these things to ordinary men; and therefore we have to find, within the experience of these men, something we can use to tell them of this that lies outwith that experience. And it is here, as it seems to me, that our failure chiefly occurs; for we cannot find that something. It is, perhaps, permissible to quote a personal example of what I mean. In the course of a discussion, a question was raised by one member of the group, which could not be satisfactorily answered unless he was made to understand that the Genesis account of the Creation and the Fall was not to be treated as a historical statement, but as nevertheless the enunciation of profound and indeed primary truth about humanity. The first part of this task was easy—too easy; but I could not find any way of conveying the second part to him. If it was not a statement of historical fact, then it was 'just a fairy story'; and as such was unworthy the attention of grown men.

The man with whom I was dealing in this case had, of course, no conception of what might be called the distinction between scientific truth and poetic truth; or perhaps more accurately, the distinction between fact and truth. But how many people are able to make such a distinction? We may approach the answer to that question by a considering of that very way of seeing and expressing truth from which my man had turned away in disgust—'fairy-tale' truth, or truth embodied in a myth. When we do so, we realize that this way of looking at truth appears and is employed on at least two different levels of human development. On the first of these, there is hardly any realization of its being myth at all. Its value may be recognized to lie deeper than what it presents as historical fact; but there is no question raised as to the literal actuality, or real occurrence, of the things so presented. (This attitude is not always confined to the more primitive thinker. It is sometimes deliberately adopted as a theory or philosophy of history—for example, consider the way in which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews handles the figure of Melchizedec; whom he regards as a historical figure, but whose existence as a matter of history is of very secondary importance.)

Over against that way of thinking, we have to set the more developed and sophisticated use of myth. The myth then is no longer something that happened as matter of history. It is a confessedly imaginary picture of some truth that is felt to be too great to be easily put into hard, matter-of-fact words. Something is true, and we know that it is true; but the only way we can describe it to ourselves is by saying 'It was as if . . . ,' or by trying to fashion a miniature reproduction of it. To those who think in this way, it would be no valid ground for rejecting any statement simply to say it was a fairy story; they might ask, 'Is it a good fairy story?' but they would also certainly inquire in what other way such truth could be conveyed to men. And in this connexion it is perhaps worth while bearing in mind the implications of such a remark as the following: 'Every theory of the course of events in nature is necessarily based on some process of simplification of the phenomena, and is to some extent therefore a fairy tale.' (Napier Shaw,

Manual of Meteorology, i. 123: quoted on the title page of Mr. G. R. Steuart's novel *Storm*.) It matters not whether that remark is intended as a guide or as a warning. The important point in it for us is the emphasis upon the necessity of the fairy-tale method. In view of what has been already said, it would appear that it is precisely this need that many people are unable or unwilling to recognize. They know enough not to take the myth literally; but they cannot see that it is the way to wisdom to continue to take the myth mythically. No matter in which of these two ways it happens to be interpreted, to such people myth remains meaningless. It talks a language whose idioms are foreign to their understanding.

III.

Is there then any other way we may seek to bring these things that are beyond the range of their experience into that range? Is there really any common ground which we can employ as a basis for our dealings with them? One such is often suggested; and though it is my aim to show reason for setting it aside, we cannot do so without some consideration. There are various ways of describing this common ground; but their variety does not indicate any real difference, and they may all be comprehended in the one description.

In this case the starting point is not the mythical, but the scientific, approach to reality. Emphasis is laid upon the influences of the sciences upon the modern mind; and in effect it is alleged that what a man learns of these in his formative years provides him with the manner of approach to everything in the realm of ideas. Then, if he find that one particular group of ideas does not lend itself to this treatment, he assumes that the fault lies, not with the approach, which has worked quite satisfactorily in other concerns, but with the ideas themselves; that, in fact, their failure to prove amenable to this approach is a proof of their unreality. Accordingly, if we are to commend the truths of religion to such a man, we must be prepared to take them into this scientifically-conditioned *Weltanschauung*, and translate them into the language which is native to it.

I do not wish to suggest that such a translating is an unnecessary thing; but I am strongly of the opinion that it is not the *most* necessary thing. And it is not the solution to our present problem, which is concerned with a much larger section of the people than could ever be included under this head. For the scientific approach presupposes at least a secondary education—*i.e.*, an education which has been continued for some time beyond the minimum school-leaving age; an education which at present is enjoyed by roughly twenty per cent. of the population.

No doubt those who leave school at the age of fourteen are to some extent affected by the prevalence of this attitude. But that fact is of no assistance in our present quest, for the influence it exerts is a negative one. Indeed we have already drawn attention to it under another name; for it is precisely this influence that is responsible for the frame of mind which is unable to take myth literally, but not yet able to take it mythically. It is a mind which is affected by, but not awakened by, the scientific approach; and it is the frame of mind to be found in a very large majority of the people of this land.

IV.

The problem, then, seems to be at least in part a problem of education; and though there is more to it than that, let us speak of that first of all. Throughout what has been said hitherto (and particularly in the second section of this essay) there has run the implication that something of the element which we call the mythical is needful for the expression of religious truth—the task of the teacher of that truth being to find the most 'likely myth,' in the sense of the myth which is at one and the same time as near as possible to the truth it would convey and as near as possible to the mind it would convince. It may well be that the myth which is suited to this age will not prove suitable to our successors; and that the 'Myth of the Twentieth Century' (in another sense than Rosenberg's) must make way for the myth of the twenty-first. But first of all we must furnish minds which are able to take in what the myth—any myth—has to say; and it is to that aim that our education must direct itself. Such education will not have a directly religious content; but it will be, in a very real sense, religious education.

Yet even that deals with only part of our problem. That may furnish us with a long-term policy, but what of the present? It is there that the problem presses upon us most urgently; and it is there that it shows itself most intractable. You cannot send a man of thirty back to school again, and hope to undo the habit of mind that the years have formed in him; and yet he, as much as his son or his grandson whom we can hope to influence, needs the truth of religion in his life. I do not know the answer to this part of the problem. It is because I do not know, and because I want to know, that this essay has been written; in the hope that by drawing attention to, and giving voice to, these matters, I may stimulate others to seek an answer along with me.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Inverted Periscope.

By the Reverend Rolf Gledhill, M.A., B.D.,
St. Germain's Vicarage, Edgbaston, Birmingham.

'Rejoice with me; for I have found the piece which I had lost.'—Lk 15^9.

Have you ever heard of an inverted periscope? This instrument was the special pride of an inventor. He had adapted for home use the periscope used on our submarines. The procedure was now reversed. Instead of some one in a submarine using a periscope to look up from below, in this land periscope the owner looked down and under. So lost things could be found. Lost treasures, lost possessions which were hidden under the furniture, or under desks and cupboards would be discovered by using this new periscope.

But the new invention has not come into general use because people do not need any device of this sort to help them find their lost treasures. There is an amusing story in a book about submarines called *Up Periscope* by David Masters. A certain submarine Commander used to hold a service for his crew every Sunday morning. But all the men did not wish to join in this service. Some preferred sleep to sermons, and wanted to spend Sunday morning in bed. So in order to stop the service they arranged that the Commander's prayer-book should be 'lost' on Sunday morning. That Sunday the usual service was not held. But during the following week everything seemed to go wrong. The submarine was hunted by enemy planes and destroyers. All their own attacks failed. On the next Sunday morning, however, the Commander saw, for the first time in his experience, the entire crew present for worship. No orders had been given, but every one was present, and the missing prayer-book had been found!

There is an interesting record in the Second Book of Kings about the finding of an important book in the Temple during the reign of King Josiah. This may have been another example of 'finding' something which was not really lost. During the reign of the previous kings, and especially under King Manasseh, the worship of Jehovah had been abolished. Now a new and terrifying enemy had appeared. They were the Scythians. The prophet Jeremiah tells how their chariots were 'as the whirlwind,' and their horses were 'swifter than eagles.' Like centaurs this foe galloped through the land, spreading destruction and ruin. 'The whole city,' we read, 'fleeth for the noise of the horsemen.' It was at such a time of confusion and bewilderment that a book dealing with the neglected way of worship was found in the Temple. The message of this book, at one time so easily discarded, was now 'discovered' by men who needed help and guidance. In the hour of danger they looked once again to the faith that had led and inspired in past days.

The discovery of this book led to a great reformation. For when King Josiah had been informed of the message in this newly found treasure, he ordered a day of National Prayer. All the people were summoned for worship, and then the King led his people in a great act of dedication. 'The King stood by the pillar, and made a covenant before the Lord, to walk after the Lord, and to keep his commandments, and his testimonies, and his statutes, with all his heart, and all his soul, to confirm the words of this covenant that were written in this book; and all the people stood to the covenant.' After this service, the reforms were started. Many of the abuses were abolished, and the people were now loyal in worship.

Perhaps, if we used an inverted periscope we also might make a discovery. If we looked into our own life we might find that we had been careless or irregular in our prayers, and in our worship. We might see that we have lost the habit of reading our Bible. If we really see this, then great possibilities await us. We can be one with all great discoverers. We can find once again a new world. New power and fresh understanding can be ours when we learn to use aright the way of worship. New strength and joy will be ours; and in this great time of discovery we shall want to call together our friends and say 'Rejoice with me, for I have found that which I had lost.'

The Forgotten Coat.

By the Reverend A. E. C. Rowan, B.A.,
Donegal.

'The cloke that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee.'—2 Ti 4^{13}.

I suppose you children don't think very much about clothes. You don't worry about their colour or their cut or their appearance. After a while you probably will. But meantime even in these days of clothes rationing you are quite content to leave all talk about clothes to your parents and other grown-ups.

At the same time you would soon begin to think about your clothes if you lost any of them. If you were forced to go barefoot in cold weather you would soon start thinking about shoes. If you had no stockings you would soon be reminded of the fact. And above all if you lost your overcoat you would immediately miss it, especially in days of winter.

You know how useful this garment is for keeping out the cold and the rain. German soldiers fighting on the Russian front have found out how very necessary warm clothes can be. No man or woman—or boy or girl—is able to brave the weather unless well protected. This has always

been true. Indeed many great men have been concerned with coats. Did you ever hear of a kind of overcoat known as Raglan? Or have you ever seen a Cardigan jacket? Both the Raglan overcoat and the Cardigan jacket take their names from generals who fought in the Crimea. These garments were their answer to the rigours of the Russian climate.

And isn't it strange to find that men in positions like theirs have bothered about such things as overcoats? When you try to picture a general you probably think of a very important person covered with medals and surrounded by a large staff. You would never imagine for a moment that he would bother very much about an overcoat. And yet Lord Raglan and Lord Cardigan did. And so have other great men. Even the Apostle Paul, as our text reminds us, once found it necessary to ask Timothy to bring him his overcoat, which he had left at a place called Troas with a man called Carpus. He may have forgotten it or he may have had to leave in a hurry and so had given it to Carpus to store for him. We don't know. But we do know that when winter came he was apparently unpleasantly reminded of the absence of his cloak and so asked Timothy to bring it to him.

And isn't there something about this request that seems to bring Paul far nearer to us? Sometimes when you hear preachers or teachers talking about Paul you may think of him as a great man—not a bit like any of yourselves. But here you see that he was just an ordinary human being like anybody else. He missed his overcoat just as you would, if you left it behind somewhere.

And if Paul was an ordinary human being like yourselves then you can be like him. I don't just mean that you can be a great missionary or a great preacher. But you can be like him in one thing—and that is the way in which he followed Jesus Christ. Paul always tried to please his Master. And Jesus helped him too. It is always ordinary people and ordinary boys and girls that Jesus does help. And when they trust Him He makes them great. You may sometimes feel very unimportant and unable to do any great deeds. But remember that all great people were once only boys and girls. And all human beings no matter how small they are, can be great if they trust Jesus and try to do His will.

The Christian Year.

SEXAGESIMA.

Lifted Veils.

BY THE REVEREND PHILIP W. LILLEY, M.A., RHU, DUNBARTONSHIRE.

'And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the vail that is spread over all nations.'—Is 25[7].

To-day all sorts and conditions of men are anxiously asking themselves and one another questions about the future of the world. These questions are asked not merely because of the serious plight of our own nation or even of Europe but because of the dreadful impasse to which the whole civilized world has come. Men's minds are being concerned with the thought of what the world may be in coming days in the light of what it is to-day.

The question, too, is not so much 'What's wrong with the world?' as 'How can the world be re-established on right and sane lines?' And so—we turn to the Bible. There we learn that we have first to see ourselves and our past doings in the light of God's countenance, and that then He will help us to become the people He longs for us to be. He did that for those Jewish exiles long ago, who were breaking their hearts for their Temple and hungry for a sight of His face.

Who can doubt for a single moment that there hangs a very heavy pall over all nations?

'The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.' It is 'waiting,' as Paul tells us, 'for the manifestation of the sons of God.' —that is, when translated into modern speech—the new World Order, and the new World Hope.

What then, are some of those veils which blind us but which God has promised to lift, so that we may see aright and enter into His saving purposes for the world.

I. First of all, there is the *Veil of Sin.* There is a profound truth in that old story in Genesis which tells of the entry of sin into the world. Sin entered the Garden of Eden through the clever and seductive words of the serpent who deceived Eve, the mother of all living. He pointed to the forbidden fruit and made it appear delightful and desirable. It was its insidious beauty and attractiveness that did the mischief. In like manner sin is made attractive to human nature through its deadly deceptiveness and through the way in which it gilds alluringly all its specious gifts and hides the face of God.

It is not until the veil is lifted and the covering ruthlessly destroyed that we see sin in all its actual deformity and naked repulsiveness. Not till that happens do we recoil in disgust and loathing from its presence, and shake off its baleful fascination, disillusioned often in a dull regret. It is a complete mistake to imagine that this is mere theological or ecclesiastical talk suitable from a pulpit. Some of you perhaps have read what is, in many ways, the most brilliant and unconventional war-book so far written. I refer to Richard Hillary's *The Last Enemy.* There he describes how he saw a woman die in an air-raid. She had been horribly wounded. He felt it was an enormity so great that it was terrifying in its implications, in its lifting of the veil on possibilities of thought so far beyond the grasp of the human mind. It was not just the German bombs or the German Air Force, or even the German mentality, but a feeling of the very essence of anti-life that no words could convey. I recognized in that moment what it was that others had instantly recognized as evil and to be destroyed utterly. I saw now that it was not crime: it was Evil itself —something of which until then I had not even

sensed the existence.' That is, I think, a very convincing testimony. It comes in near the end of the book and represents what was for him a very decided conversion in his world of ideas. Yes, God is unveiling sin before our eyes to-day.

II. God is lifting another veil that has covered the eyes of the nations—the *prevalent notion of man's self-sufficiency*. It takes such a long time before men and women are entirely convinced that they cannot by any manner of means save themselves. It is often too along a very rough and hard road that the truth is brought home to their minds. Through pain and suffering our sins and errors may be unmasked, and our illusion of self-sufficiency shattered.

For a long time people everywhere thought that inevitably and through its own unaided powers and faculties the human race would march forward into perfection. But now it ought to be crystal clear, except to the completely blind, that man has palpably failed. This notion of human self-sufficiency is by no means the monopoly of the German people. It is, as D. R. Davies puts it, 'the sin of Europe, nay, of the whole civilized world: it is the sin of a society that has suffered from the cardinal illusion of its own omnipotence. It is the sin, in short, of a civilization that has rejected a transcendental God.'

Man *has* failed to save himself. Surely he sees it now. Surely mankind recognizes his failure writ large on a thousand flaming towns, on a world made desolate, and in hearts pierced by myriad sorrows. Surely he sees placarded before his very eyes the necessity for a divine deliverance wrought through the dynamic of the gospel. In *Midnight Hour*—a very striking book of to-day—the writer emphasizes this very forcibly: 'When we dare to confront that giant evil, we know that the minimized Jesus of Victorianism is no champion for such lists as these: it is only by facing it and this vast and terrible Apollyon in life, that we can regain our lost sense of the grandeur of God and the scale of the conquest of Christ. As we realize the transcendence of this evil which straddles our world and dwarfs and pulverizes our powers, so we return to the realization of the transcendent Godhead which alone can overcome it.'

For one of the hopeful features of the thought of to-day is just the increasing sense, in some quarters, of the helplessness of man apart from the saving power of the gospel. Many who ignored or despised Christian teaching are being taught through their very despair to look up and outside themselves for salvation. God is lifting the veil on our proud defiance of His sovereignty and showing man that, apart from the Christian gospel, there is nothing for him but despair, loneliness, darkness, chill, and death. 'Truly if this war does not mean moral and spiritual regeneration, it means moral and spiritual catastrophe. This time there is no middle way possible.'

III. There is still another veil which God in His matchless compassion is lifting. This veil He lifts in order to comfort and console the sorrowful. This is the *Veil of Sorrow*.

The picture suggested here is that of a figure whose head is covered in token of mourning. In Eastern lands the mourner often had his face shrouded. He could not face the glare of publicity but shrank from meeting his fellow-men. But the Bible tells us in this passage of One who can enter the stricken home and speak the word of comfort without hurting or wounding the feelings; and when He comes, He removes the heavy veil of mourning, and gazing with perfect sympathy on the slowly falling tears with ineffable tenderness He wipes them away. 'And the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces.' Perhaps no words that were ever uttered have sunk deeper into the aching heart of humanity than this exquisite image of the divine tenderness. In the Book of the Revelation it is expressed with an even finer touch of intimate personal sympathy, 'And God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes.'

How many millions in the world there are who need this divine comfort and strength! Robert Burns once said that, if he could, he would wipe away the tears from all faces. But it is not given to man to do this great and gracious thing. Only God can do it—the Father of comfort and God of all consolation; and He does it. Only He can speak the healing word. Only He can in the silence remove the traces of blinding grief and bitter tears and bestow upon the sorrowful His peace.

QUINQUAGESIMA.

The Love of God.

BY THE REVEREND ALEXANDER CAMPSIE, M.C., M.A., CHAPLAIN, ROYAL NAVY.

'And Jesus stood still, and commanded him to be called.'—Mk 10^{49}.

'And Jesus stood still'—an incidental remark in the narrative in the characteristic manner of this Evangelist. We come upon these touches all through this Gospel. They help to make Jesus live before our eyes.

'And Jesus stood still'—a simple circumstance. Yet we begin to see it in another light. For it is not only He who was the Son of Man whom we see passing along upon His way; it is also the Lord of Heaven. And it is as if all Heaven stood still in answer to the cry of this blind man. A beggar by the wayside, a poor down-and-out, such was Bartimæus—one of these negligible people in the community, of no importance to any one, indeed a public nuisance with his shouting and importuning of the passers-by. People like that should not be allowed to get in the way. They should be segregated, locked up. The authorities ought to do something about it. Such is the common attitude of the world towards folk like Bartimæus. But that is not Heaven's attitude. While it was the concern of many in that company to shut up the clamour of this blind beggar, and to get him out of the way, Jesus made him the centre of the scene.

We are reminded here that the need of the humblest individual is never overlooked or forgotten amid all Heaven's high purposes. God is never so concerned with the ordering of the

high affairs of His great universe that He has no time to 'stand still,' so that He may deal with our little individual needs. Look again at this context. Jesus, our great Revealer of God, was on a journey. He had passed through Jericho and was on His way to Jerusalem. Jesus was going up to Jerusalem to die. There was, He recognized, no other way of fulfilling God's purpose of saving the world. Surely, then, to get there speedily, and to get the cruel ordeal through and done with, was the thing that mattered. In His high purpose of saving the world, why should He 'stand still' to interest Himself in the trouble of blind Bartimæus? Was not the lesser service included in the greater? If we walk in spirit along that way with Jesus, we shall discover how alien to His mind were any thoughts like these. The thought of what lay at the end of it never for a moment dulled His sense of the urgency of men's pressing and immediate needs. Even at the very last, with the thought of the sins and sorrows of a whole world in His heart, He could yet bend His loving interest to the service of a poor miserable creature, a dying thief, who hung beside Him on the Cross.

So it is that Jesus taught men to think about God. And so it is that you and I must learn to think about Him. We live in a vast and mysterious universe. When, with the Psalmist, we lift up our eyes and look upon the heavens, the moon and the stars which He has ordained, when we contemplate the wonder of the rolling spheres, we say, 'What is man, that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man, that thou visitest him?' It is a mood that comes to all of us. It sometimes seems altogether too preposterous that the Creator and Sustainer of these immensities should have any care or thought for a humble individual's life. But the Psalmist, while he knew this mood, did not arrive at that conclusion. On the contrary, what filled him with amazement was that this great and wonderful God never failed to hear and respond to the faintest human cry—'this poor man cried, and the Lord heard him, and saved him out of all his troubles.' That to him was the amazing thing. And so Isaiah, when he bids men 'lift up their eyes, and behold who hath created these things,' goes on to declare—not that such a God can have no interest in men's puny affairs, but just the very opposite, that from this wonderful God no man's way is hidden, and no individual's cry passed over. That is the glorious truth about God which the Bible everywhere proclaims, not so much the divine power and greatness as the love and tender compassion which infuses them, the love that stoops and seeks entrance at the humble door of the individual heart.

And so it is that you and I must learn to think of God. I suppose that all of us believe in some sense in the love of God. We know it as a kind of vague benevolence permeating the universe, holding things together in some kind of order, and providing for our material wants. But what a pale shadow it is to most of us! How few of us ever realize it as a personal and individual possession, the most precious by far of all our possessions. How few of us come to the central message of the gospel, and learn to say with awe and wonder in our souls that 'God loves *me*.'

'And Jesus stood still' in response to the cry of a blind beggar by the wayside. Such is God's way. And it must become man's way, too, if he is to succeed in forwarding and furthering the high purposes of God.

Many to-day are full of great schemes for the future, and occupied with all manner of plans for curing the world of its wrongs. And these may be sound and praiseworthy enough. But in their pursuit of them, and in their pressing on to their accomplishment, how readily they forget the folks by the wayside. If some would talk a bit less about that 'new order' they hope to set up, and get on with the urgent and immediate business of helping the folks about them, in their homes, in their places of business, in their churches, in all their personal relationships, there might be a real chance of their getting somewhere with their fine schemes. If there is ever to be an order of the kind they envisage, it is *there* that its foundations must be laid. It will never stand, however cleverly buttressed, unless it is built on love and mutual helpfulness between man and man, on compassion for a fellow-being's need, and an immediate readiness to come to his aid, regardless of the sacrifice. And these are things which can only be learned in the company of Jesus Christ.

Of course, it is the people like the Priest and the Levite in the Parable who appear to get on in this world. They frequently reach the point at which they are aiming, and do the things they set out to do. But it is the people like the Samaritan who really do God's work in the world, and who in the deepest, though quite unspectacular, way make history. It is people like Francis Chisholm in Cronin's novel, *The Keys of the Kingdom*, who get God's purposes fulfilled. It is men like him who have in them the spirit of Christ. Failure may seem to be written all across their lives in this world, as it seemed to be written across His, but 'success' is what God writes across them. And mysteriously it is given them in their souls to know it—which is their reward.

I end with a little parable—the parable of the river which never reached the sea. Many years ago, I landed with a friend at a little seaport town on the eastern side of Greece. We turned westward along the coast, and, after an hour's walking, our path brought us to a dip which we recognized as a river-bed. But all that it contained was sand and stones and huge boulders. There was no water there; the river had apparently dried up. An empty river-bed is no inspiring sight, and we had a sense of disappointment. We wandered up its course, and after a bit there came a pleasant surprise. We saw, opening up before us, a rich green valley, with a flourishing village. And the secret of its prosperity was the river! There it was, quite a considerable stream. It did not reach the sea for the simple reason that it was drained off in little canals and artificial runways to water and keep fresh and make fertile

the fields and gardens of the folks who dwelt there. We had thought of that river as a failure. It seems the proper business of a river to reach the sea. But when we found the explanation we changed our view. Any stream that made such a happy valley could be no failure. God, I am sure, would count it a success.

FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT.

Why Comes Temptation?

BY THE REVEREND JOHN SHORT, M.A., Ph.D., BOURNEMOUTH.

'Blessed is the man that endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him.'—Ja 1^{12}.

Why comes temptation? Wouldn't life be simpler, easier, and happier if we could dispense with it? Do we not often resent the fact that we alone of all the sentient creation are divided against ourselves, and are at variance with ourselves? And yet, whether we resent it or not, temptation is one of the inevitable elements in life. Were we to draw up a list of living, practical problems, temptation would necessarily be included among them. William James has said, 'No man has matriculated in the university of life till he has been well tempted.' The genius of the Bible is revealed in the fact that as man first steps upon the world's stage one of the first things that happen to him is that he is tempted. That story in Genesis is one of the best descriptions of temptation in all literature.

Granted the fact, why does it come? Who let loose this serpent in the human garden? There are some who would blame God! Fitzgerald has written:

> Oh, Thou, who didst with pitfall and with gin
> Beset the Road I was to wander in,
> Thou wilt not with Predestined Evil round
> Enmesh, and then impute my Fall to Sin!

But Fitzgerald has gone far astray. For God does not tempt us. The constant witness of the Bible is that God is unversed in the ways of sin. No morally perfect being could tempt any man to become a thief, or a drunkard, and then punish him for falling into sin. Fitzgerald is wrong. Again, it will help us to realize that temptation is not sin! The Master was tempted, but did not fall. Sin only begins when we begin to play with our temptation, when we let it dupe our imagination, for a tempted imagination is a duped imagination. It is, indeed, impossible to avoid temptation; it is not impossible to resist it. Never has it been true for any man to say, 'My temptations are greater than I.' But that still leaves our main question unanswered—Why comes temptation?

In the first place, if we resent our temptations let it be noted that it is possible to get rid of them—at a price. There is a school of thought that says the best way to deal with temptations is to yield to them. But one can only yield at the price of self-respect. Self-respect at its highest and best is our sense of our worth to God, to our fellowmen, and to ourselves, and, in fact, we are tempted because it is possible for us to hold these high ideals of self-respect. Lose them, and you will cease to be tempted, for in essence temptation is just the tendency to fall away from all these ideals, aspirations, resolutions, and convictions that under-gird the great ideal of self-respect. Or, to put it otherwise, temptation comes because there are always two aspects to every human soul. None of us is completely good. None of us is completely evil. Just because there are these two sides to our human nature, as it were, the elements of Jekyll and Hyde, temptation comes. When we identify ourselves with our higher ideals, when we seek to throw the weight of our personality on their side, then we are bound to repress these other impulses and desires and inward cravings in our own nature, quite apart from the down-dragging influences that are always lurking in the way of our environment. But these lower elements are constantly being stimulated by suggestions and circumstances and opportunities that appeal to them, and awaken them. It is then that they make themselves felt, or if you like, heard. No one could ever be tempted unless there were something in him that responded to tempting circumstance. At its deepest, perhaps, men are their own tempters. One great thinker has daringly said, 'The personal devil at bottom is oneself,' and there is enough truth in the suggestion to give us pause and to set us on our guard.

We can get rid of our temptations, as you may see, if we are willing to rid ourselves of our higher possibilities. J. D. Beresford, in his novel *The Tapestry*, has told the story of a young wife who did her utmost to reclaim her husband's father, who had fallen into disreputable ways. She took him from the foul slum where he was living to a home in the country, set him among good, decent people in the hope that she might succeed in her aim. But the interesting study is the effect on the man himself. He did not want these things. He saw clearly that she wanted to give him back his self-respect, but for years he had been trying to rid himself of his self-respect, so that he could wallow, without shame, in the filth he had come to love. Little wonder he took the first opportunity that occurred to him to escape. Yes, we can get rid of our temptations at a price, the price of our self-respect.

Once more, the strength of temptation is the measure of moral quality. Will you note that? Sometimes we sing:

> . . . they who fain would serve Thee best
> Are conscious most of wrong within.

The cynic may sneer that this is only a matter of temperament. Yet it is far more. The greatest souls have always been those who have suffered the greatest temptation, but the strength of their temptation is the measure of their greatness. Very many self-complacent people are quite unaware of any battle within their breast. Very

many feel no urge to fight for God, for great causes, for righteousness. It is not surprising that such people are assailed by no great temptations. They have adjusted their tasks to their standards, and under-estimated their powers; but is this a mark of moral nobility, or moral littleness? The fight with temptation is an integral part of manhood's battle. In fact, it is the great moral battle for true manhood and true womanhood. The Master Himself fully shared our nature, and if the record is true—and who can doubt it?—all His life He suffered the most powerful temptations. Supremely He lived the greatest life that was ever lived, but as some one has put it, 'on what a gale-swept summit of temptation Jesus Christ stood and conquered.'

Again, why comes temptation? It comes as opportunity to win power for still greater battles, and for still greater conquests. That opportunity came to Peter one day when Jesus Christ called him away from his nets and his boats to discipleship. In one clear-sighted moment this impulsive man saw what the call meant, and his first impulse was to turn it aside. 'Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord.' But in the end he accepted his opportunity, fought his battle and won his victory. At the end of his days it was a greater Peter who, having had to fight, to fall, to rise, to fight and to win again and again, was carried out to die for the sake of his Lord, than the strong young man who heard the call first when he was hauling his nets on blue Galilee. So it has come to many another, and so it came to the Master Himself. It came to Him in the wilderness. 'Don't take the way of the Cross, there are easier methods of winning the world for God. Try the road of politics, or of social reform, or of spectacular prodigies of power!' No one will ever know how fierce the battle was that Christ fought and won in the wilderness. But He used the strength He wrested from His victory in order to fight the greater battle of the Cross. It came to Him as opportunity.

And where are temptations overcome? In the region whence they spring—within ourselves, in the mind, the soul, the heart. The war is within us. 'As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he.' Temptation can be overcome when the evil passion is purged by a stronger good passion. Chalmers spoke of the 'expulsive power of a new affection.' In the Ulysses legend when Ulysses sailed past the coast of the Sirens he tied himself to the mast, having stopped the ears of his mariners with wax that they might not hear, and that he himself might not succumb to the lure of the Sirens' song. But that was a poor way of winning a victory. Much greater was the victory of Orpheus, who sat unconcerned on the deck playing his own music. He, too, was a musician, and his music made the song of the Sirens sound like harsh discords. So may temptation be defeated. The evil passion can be driven out by a greater, more noble passion. And the noblest passion of all can become the master motive of our lives. We need someone to adore, someone to worship, someone to follow, someone to serve. 'Blessed is the man that endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him.'

SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Paradox of Christian Witness.

BY THE REVEREND JAMES S. STEWART, B.D., EDINBURGH.

'Rise and stand upon thy feet: for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee . . . a witness.'—Ac 26[16].

At the very centre of the Christian attitude to life stands one perpetual paradox: a startling combination of the most profound humility with the most defiant conviction. There is in fact no other religious or ethical system in the world which has dared to set before its followers at one and the same time such apparently contradictory ideals—the most downright self-abasement and the most blazing assurance.

See how this is focused in our text. Here was Saul of Tarsus levelled to the dust, beggared of the last atom of the self-sufficiency of the morally religious man, with all the years of proud good works behind him suddenly shrivelled up, and all his spiritual egotism wrecked for ever: that is the one side of the paradox. And the other is this—the same man, flooded with the power of Jesus, turning a dauntless face to the world. 'Rise, stand upon thy feet, for I will make thee a witness.' That is the characteristic Christian achievement—absolute humility, uttermost assurance!

(1) *A true Christian will always be a man marked by a great humility of heart.* That is basic and essential. Nowhere surely are pride and self-importance more incongruous than in the servant of the Cross.

But this is just the difficulty. Pride would not be the cardinal sin it is, if it did not possess this demonic quality, that precisely where you would expect to find it dead for ever, there it reappears, insinuating itself in even subtler guise. 'The final human pretension,' declares Reinhold Niebuhr, 'is made most successfully under the ægis of a religion which has overcome human pretension in principle.' Or, to put it more bluntly, there is no sin so dangerous as conscious goodness. That, says C. S. Lewis, is 'the complete anti-God state of mind.'

There is a passage in Romans where Paul suddenly exclaims—'I am an apostle: I magnify mine office.' Well, it is right to do that. We are meant to think greatly of Christ's commission to us to be His witnesses. But that there can be a false way of going about Christ's work the Apostle himself reminds us in another passage. Read the fourth chapter of 1 Corinthians, and you will see the Apostle's irony flashing like a rapier against the self-display, the standing upon dignity, the personal stratagems which had intruded themselves into the Corinthian Church. 'Remember,' says that great chapter in effect, 'there is a vast difference between standing on one's

dignity and standing on the Rock of Ages! The first is silly, tragic nonsense—the second is the strong sanity of faith.'

This essential humility of the true Christian witness is rooted in two facts.

(i) One is *the magnitude of the task.* To build something of the New Jerusalem in the sphere where God has set you; to fight for social justice and the Christian ethic in the wider community; to take upon yourself and carry something of the miseries that break men's hearts and the sins that rot their souls; to confront the tragedies of life, and make your personal faith a bulwark for others, the shadow of a great rock in a weary land—can you conceive any task more humbling in its appalling responsibility?

(ii) The other fact is *the unworthiness of the witness himself.* Who are we to witness for Jesus Christ? Our best insights are so fragmentary, our ignorance so abysmal. Our doom it is that with no atom of personal merit, with nothing but broken contrition and the shame of sin's corruption, we have to witness to Jesus and His love. There will be days when the sense of unworthiness smites and shatters us, until we cry 'My God, why hast Thou forsaken me?' Then perhaps Isaiah's experience will be ours, and the angel will touch our lips with a live coal from off the altar of God.

(2) Pass now to the other side of the paradox. Downright self-abasement—*and blazing assurance*: '*Rise, stand upon thy feet!*'

It is quite mistaken to suppose that humility excludes conviction. 'What we suffer from to-day, wrote G. K. Chesterton, 'is humility in the wrong place. Modesty has moved from the organ of ambition. Modesty has settled upon the organ of conviction, where it was never meant to be. A man was meant to be doubtful about himself, but undoubting about the truth; this has been exactly reversed.' These words are worth pondering. Far too often our Christian witness has been deferential and apologetic when it ought to have been prophetic and trumpet-toned; it has wasted time balancing probabilities and discussing opinions and erecting interrogation-marks, when it ought to have been ringing out the note of unabashed triumphant affirmation.

This is no time for Christ's witnesses to be soft-pedalling their distinctive message; no time for that peculiarly unpleasant form of servility which regards it as a feather in the Church's cap if some scientist or philosopher speaks approvingly and patronizingly of our holy religion; no time to be watering down the radical and challenging content of the Christian faith to suit the taste of any vague, indeterminate humanism that boggles at the supernatural. We shall never do Christ's work to-day, unless—like our Master—we can speak with authority and not as the scribes.

But whence comes this authority?

(i) It comes, first, from the fact that *it is God's Word, not our own, to which we witness.* When Temple Gairdner of Cairo was an undergraduate, he took some share in student meetings organized by one of the religious societies in the University. 'Do I speak at a meeting?' he wrote in a letter to a friend, 'I am asked, "Are you better than those here, that you speak to them?" Nay, but Christ is better—I do not speak of myself but of Him.' It is this that can redeem our stammering lips from confusion, and give the veriest sinner words that ring like iron and shine like flame.

(ii) Another ground of authority is *the testimony of the Christian centuries behind and of the Universal Church around.* You are not isolated and alone when you bear witness to Christ to-day. You are backed by the witness of two thousand years. Behind you stands the august pageant of the gathering years. Remember who are your kith and kin: all the brave in every age who have witnessed—all who are bravely witnessing now—to one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one Cross, one victory, one mercy-seat, one building not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. Thus our littleness and inadequacy are caught up into the context of historic Christianity; and back of our witness there is—not the dogmatism of self-assured complacency—but the authoritative testimony of a great cloud of witnesses, the glorious company of the apostles, the goodly fellowship of the prophets, the noble army of martyrs, and the holy Church throughout all the world.

(iii) The final ground of authority is *the confidence of personal experience.* 'What this parish needs,' growled Thomas Carlyle, 'is a minister who knows God otherwise than by hearsay.' It is the great need of the whole world to-day—a multitude of Christians who know God otherwise than by rumour and report. The Book of Acts tells of certain Jewish exorcists who tried to do the works of God and cast out evil spirits by using the formula: 'I adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth.' As if miracles could be wrought in the name of someone else's Christ! It is not surprising that the sons of Sceva met the blunt retort: 'Jesus we know, and Paul we know, but who are ye?' The true witness can always say with the Apostle, 'My gospel! This I have experienced, and this I most surely know.'

Such knowledge is always a growing thing. 'I will make thee a witness, both of the things which thou hast seen, *and of those in the which I will appear unto thee.*' This is what keeps religion from the blight of staleness and stagnation—a first-hand experience, never inert and static, never dependent merely on past episodes and encounters you had with Jesus long ago, but always dynamic and developing, always with insight added to insight, and wonder piled on wonder, from the moment when you first accept service under the banner of the Cross, until the long campaign is over and the evening comes, and your work on earth is done.

Miguel de Unamuno.

I. The Man.

By the Reverend Geraint V. Jones, M.A., B.Litt., Halifax.

I.

Unamuno once said that every Basque has in him a fox, but that he himself had two. His character and writings (for his writings reveal his character) bear adequate testimony to this statement. If roguishness is a characteristic of the fox, then Unamuno certainly has a double share of *zorrería*, of foxhood, for his roguish paradoxicality, his whimsical impishness, his love of playing with ideas and with his reader so that one does not know if one is standing on one's head or on one's feet, the unpredictability of his thought: these are the expression of a vehement and roguish nature. One of the most striking things about his writings is their flame-like vividness and tumultuous impetuosity, his thoughts falling over each other in their haste to be made less effusive by taking on the lasting form of speech which is nevertheless too narrow a vessel for him. Señor Madariaga, in his brilliant book *Englishmen, Frenchmen and Spaniards* (a study in comparative racial psychology) has described, in a chapter on 'Thought in the Man of Passion,' as the typical feature of Spanish thinking 'the subordination of thought to passion,' and refers to the inequality of the thought of the Spaniard which is the 'permanent witness of the volcanic nature of his intellectual production.' Spain is rich in genius, but poor in talent, and lacking in collective thinking. The whole of this chapter of Madariaga's book is an excellent aid to the appreciation of Unamuno's special genius; for whether, with a twinkle in his eye, he describes himself as having a double dose of the *zorro* or overwhelms us with a mass of ideas which quickly bear fruit in our minds, he is in all things an individualist, an improvisor, and volcanically productive. If the Basques share this universal Spanish characteristic of individualism, then Unamuno is a good Basque; if being a good Basque means the application of exploratory daring to the regions of the spirit, then there could be no better exponent of Basqueness than he. His writings, for example, especially his commentary on *Don Quixote*, abound in quotations from his fellow-Basque, Ignatius Loyola, but it is as a Quixotist that his Spanish individualism is most prominent. Cervantes is to Unamuno what Dostoievski is to Berdyæv; in fact Madariaga somewhere describes him as 'our Dostoievski.' He is the concrete Cervantist philosopher, playing with the concepts of appearance and reality, truth and illusion, idealism and rationalism, life and dream, as a child plays with a ball, or, if we are to retain the simile of the fox, as a fox exercises its mischievous ingenuity. Unamuno doubtless exasperates the rationalist, the man who prides himself on the scientific realism of his thinking, just as he himself is exasperated by the very scepticism which is the basis of what he calls the 'tragic sense of life.' To any one who seeks a robust faith, dissatisfied with timid ventures and corroding doubt, he is a tonic; and in an age the main characteristic of which is its lack of ultimate standards, his passionate defence of the individual's hunger for self-perpetuation in the eternal world is a welcome reminder that the mind illuminated by daring imagination and impulsive thinking can penetrate further in its analysis of the human spirit than the cold negativeness of rationalism.

For Unamuno is essentially a rebel against the spirit of the modern world, against its rationalism, its æstheticism, its ethicism. In an age of reason he vindicates the primacy of faith, yet he is a rebel against faith because it is through this rebellion against it that he is able to realize the extent and depth of his faith. 'The faith that does not doubt is a dead faith,' he says in his *Agonía del Cristianismo*. He rebels against the Catholicism which he defends, for he abhors denominational labels.

> 'My religion,' he says, 'is to seek truth in life and life in truth, even though knowing full well that I shall never find them so long as I live; my religion is to wrestle unceasingly and unwearyingly with the mystery . . . . At all hazards I seek to scale the unattainable.' 'I do not wish to have myself labelled, for I, Miguel de Unamuno, like every other man who aspires to full consciousness, am a unique species . . . I count every man a Christian who invokes the name of Christ with respect and love, and I am repelled by the orthodox who deny the Christianity of those who interpret the gospel differently from themselves.' 'Liberal or progressive fools will take me for a reactionary and perhaps for a mystic, without, of course, understanding what they mean, and conservative and reactionary fools will take me for a kind of spiritual anarchist.'

A Catholic, yet unwilling to be confined to any exclusive conception of Christianity, a Liberal, a disliker of authority, yet liable to be called a reactionary, he writes a long devotional poem, *El Cristo de Velazquez*, inspired by the contemplation of Velazquez' painting of Christ on the Cross, a poem in the true Spanish Catholic tradition of St. John of the Cross. It is in line with the *Pietás* which one sees so often in Spanish churches and monasteries, representing a baroque, bleeding, tormented, fleshly Christ such as the one at Santa Clara, Palencia, about which he wrote a vivid and passionate essay in his *Andanzas y Visiones Españolas*; Unamuno is Catholic through and through, though his Catholicism is of the order of Von Hügel's rather than of orthodoxy. A non-dogmatic Catholic, he is at home in the literature of Unitarianism and English Evangelical Protestantism; a Quixotist, he is at the same time a Sanchopanzist.

In most of the things that he did he was an individualist, perhaps proud of the fact that he preferred to act and think as others did not act or think. Soon after graduating at Madrid University his immediate chances of being awarded an academic position were ruined by his unconventional style of thought and his dislike of formal philosophy. Owing to his outspoken criticism of abuses and corruption he was deprived of the rectorship of Salamanca University, though his sentence of sixteen years' imprisonment was immediately annulled. He achieved greater international reputation than most of his contemporaries. His novel *Niebla*, for example, was translated into German, French, Italian, English, Dutch, Swedish, Danish, Russian, Polish, Czech, Hungarian, Rumanian, Serbian, Greek, and Lithuanian. His *Tragic Sense of Life* and his *Life of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza* were translated into six and three languages respectively. He became a figure of European dimensions. But, in spite of his fame, his encyclopædic knowledge of European thought, and his familiarity with several European languages, he did not regard himself as European in spirit. 'I am not European, not what is called European,' he wrote in 1906, and to the scientific temper of the West he opposed something older, deeper, and more indigenous to a peasant people: an instinctual approach to life and thought. The diagrammatic clarity and illuminated analytical incisiveness of Ortega y Gasset are quite foreign to him. As he says somewhere, it is warmth we need, not light (commenting on Goethe's last words *Mehr Licht!*); and it is fire, rather than light, which gives his work its character, not the cold scintillation of a brilliant intellect.

In a word, Unamuno is one of those people whom it is difficult to classify. In this, perhaps, he is a true Spaniard, for though Spain has been rich in personalities she has been poor in 'schools' and collective thinking. She has produced individual politicians, but no strong, coherent parties; great artists, but no schools of painting; great men of letters, but no continuous supply of them. Modern Spain is rich in outstanding and versatile men, but poor in the average. Unamuno is one of the least classifiable of them all; and quite rightly so, for he was opposed to everything which tended to de-individualize man, the most individual thing in the world, the 'man of flesh and bone,' to use his constantly recurring phrase. He criticized socialism because of its 'confused notion of the supreme end of the individual life,' and in his glorious essay on *The Tower of Monterrey*, written in 1916, he observed that 'the greatest thing that men can see is another man, and if they once saw him utterly and completely they would carry him with them for ever'; and elsewhere he writes 'Each day I believe less and less in the social question, in the political question, and in the æsthetic question and in the moral question, and in all the other questions which people have invented in order that they shall not have to face resolutely the only real question that exists—the human question, which is mine, yours, his, every one's.' It is man that matters, not humanity in the abstract; the 'man of flesh and bone,' the actual, living, individual man, not the collective, the man of theory, the idea of a man. A Quixotist like the great hidalgo of Cervantes, he defied the windmills, the machines, the incorporation of the scientific spirit. The end of man for him is not organization, mass-integration, but 'humanity, personalized humanity, humanity individualized.' He will have none of the modern belief that man is everything but what he has made of himself, for as an individual, as the one who is unique among all his other fellow-men, he has a hand in the moulding of his own destiny. He is morally responsible for his actions. For him the Cervantist epigram is true: 'Every man is the son of his own works.' Man, the individual, must therefore not be thought of as fading helplessly into the background of the collective, or as being explicable in terms of social conditions and relationships, economic forces, and so forth, which is the contemporary emphasis. Man is the central question, *the* man, *a* man, not the conditions in which he lives. Let us by all means improve social and economic conditions, he contends in an essay on the *Materialism of the Masses* (1909), let us solve the problem of work, let us have an ideal socialist society; but what then? What is it all for? What is to be the end of life, the quality of its citizens?

> ' A country in which people think only of getting rich is a country . . . well, I would rather not inquire what kind of a country it is . . . and if a country which is solely preoccupied with getting rich is abhorrent to me, still more abhorrent is the country in which the dominant preoccupation is that of enjoyment, of diversion.'

No: man is not an economic man, an æsthetic man, or any other classifiable man: he is himself, an individual, a man of ' flesh and bone.' He is a person who, even though he may appear to be indifferent to his ultimate destiny, can be seen in all that he does to long passionately for his self-perpetuation; he is consumed by the ' hunger of immortality ' (*el hambre de inmortalidad*). A valuable thought, and one of which we should not lose sight in a collectivist age, and by which all ' planning ' should be judged. This strong plea for individuality runs right through Unamuno's two great books, *The Tragic Sense of Life* and *The Life of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza*, and differentiates the religious from the sociological study of man, of which Unamuno was well aware. For Unamuno thinking in broad social categories is not the way to achieve any understanding of concrete, personalized humanity, for he protests against what he calls ' the sacrifice of the individual concrete man upon the altar of the abstract idea.' ' They tell me that I am here to realize I know not what end: but I feel that I, like each of my fellows, am here to realize myself, to live.' And so we are; the tragedy is that so few people know what it means to realize themselves.

This thought underlies Unamuno's conception of religion and ethics. He sees the need to recover the vocational sense in our daily occupations. ' The soul sacrificed to livelihood,' not the question of wages, is the greatest human problem. Work had become depersonalized. Man feels the sense of separation between himself and what he does. Neither employer nor employed has any longer a moral attitude towards work; it is merely something to be done, to be got through, to be paid for, something inevitable and, on the whole, unpleasant. And though he dislikes Luther, Unamuno gives him credit for having established the religious value of civil occupations. ' With the disappearance of the concrete individuality the basis of all religion, the religious sense of the business calling disappears also.' Men no longer regard themselves as irreplaceable spirits, but as tools.

Unamuno's mood at times approaches one of mystical rhapsody, as in the great chapter on Love, Suffering, Pity, and Personality in *The Tragic Sense of Life*, a further example being his poem *El Cristo de Velasquez*. Yet he does not look with favour on the mystical life if it leads the mystic to separation from this world and, in the name of piety, from its common life. Here again he is in the tradition of St. Teresa and Ignatius of Loyola. The exhortation to imitate Christ is one to ' take up each one his cross—the cross of his own civil occupation—civil and not merely religious—and to embrace it, and carry it, looking towards God and striving to make each out of his calling a true prayer.' ' Instead of renouncing the world in order to dominate it . . . what we ought to do is to dominate the world in order that we may be able to renounce it.' Throughout his religious writing there is evident this common-sense, concrete attitude towards the relation between religion and life, an attitude which is as robust as that of the great Spanish artists towards the relation between art and life. Life, warmth, solidity are the characteristics of Spanish art, old and modern: of Morales, Murillo, Velazquez, Zurbaran, and of Goya, Sorolla, Zubiaurre, and Zuloaga. It represents the thing as it is, in all its dimensions, not as a pattern of abstract qualities. So it is with Unamuno's thought. He is not interested in ethical theory, though he knows most of what has been said and written about it; he is interested in the human situation, in man's longings, in his pain and his exaltation, as the data upon which a conception of ethics is to be built. Similarly, History for Unamuno is not a form of dialectic motion, cosmic movement, biological rhythm: it is ' the thought of God in the world of man ' (*El Agonia del Cristianismo*), or, as he expresses it at greater length in his essay on *The Tower of Monterrey*:

> ' The thought of God is History (*el pensamiento de Dios es la Historia*): human history, civil history, the history of civil humanity, in which God became man and dwelt among men, and proclaimed that His Kingdom, the Kingdom of God, that is the Kingdom of Man, the Kingdom of the God-Man, is not of this world of sorrows and joys, of hates and loves and memories and hopes. . . . History of what God thinks, what he goes on thinking. And he who lives in history, more or less audible and visible, whatever the fashion of his life, however far beneath the surface, lives in the thought of God, and abiding in God's thought, he abides in God.' [1]

That is, God's thinking is not something abstract, confined to metaphysics, but the very actual thing of human history, and history is a concrete actualization of something else that is actual: God's purpose. ' The Thought became History ' is not far removed from ' The Word became Flesh.'

[1] *La Torre de Monterrey a la Luz de la Helada*, in *Andanzas y Visiones Españolas*. I have used Mr. Crawford Flitch's translation of this fine essay in the volume *Essays and Soliloquies*. I am indebted to Mr. Flitch's introduction to the volume for some of the facts of Unamuno's life as outlined below.

II.

Miguel de Unamuno y Jugo was born in Bilbao on 29th September 1864. As a child he witnessed the bombardment of the town and the formation of the short-lived Spanish Republic of 1873. The atmosphere of his early life was that of a pious Catholicism, which was later challenged by his study of Descartes, Kant, Hegel, and philosophy in general. In 1880 he was studying in Madrid, and must have exhibited great precocity, for he was soon awarded his doctorate in philosophy and literature. When he applied for the chair of philosophy at Madrid University his application was rejected because he did not comply closely enough with the more orthodox habits of academic thought. In 1891 he was appointed to the chair of Greek at Salamanca University, which became his permanent home, and in 1900 began the short period of his rectorship of the University. His earliest publication was a novel, *Paz en Guerra* (1897), which was followed by another, *Amor y Pedagogia*, in 1903. In the meantime he found himself one of the 'generation of '98,' some of whom were clamouring for the Europeanization of Spain and for something resembling a post-mortem on the system which had led to the defeat of Spain and the loss of her colonies in the Spanish-American War. Though Unamuno saw the need for a renaissance of Spanish life and thought, he was not convinced that the way to it lay through the westernization which several of his contemporaries advocated. Spain possessed her own traditions, her roots were in her own, not general European history, and the lines along which these should be developed were peculiar to herself. A Europeanized Spaniard was for Unamuno a de-Hispanized Spaniard; but, as has been already said, the paradox of his life was that he was destined more than most of his contemporaries to become a European figure. Unamuno's fear lest Spain should lose her character by being absorbed into the stream of European thought, however, did not prevent him from acquiring an encyclopedic familiarity with European thought in all its aspects, as a perusal of *The Tragic Sense of Life* abundantly illustrates. There must be few people who have read Kierkegaard in the original, and quotations from Phillips Brooks and Tennyson are not the kind of thing one would expect to find in a book by a Spaniard. Unamuno's antipathy towards 'Europeanization' seems all the more paradoxical when one realizes that most of his authors were read in the original.

From 1900 onwards Unamuno's output of *belles lettres* was considerable. In 1903 he published a volume entitled *Mi Paiś* (*My Country*), which was followed by a collection of poems. In 1911 there appeared a volume of sonnets (Unamuno was a fine sonneteer), and in the same year his *Mi Religion y Otros Ensayos*. His essayistic publications were collected later in seven volumes, and in addition to these were published his *Solioquios y Conversaciones*, the delightful *Andanzas y Visiones Españolas* (1922), which must be among the best essays of their kind, various novels, a long religious poem *El Cristo de Velazquez*, three books written in exile and published in Paris and Buenos Ayres, and his two most famous books, *The Life of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza* (1905), and *The Tragic Sense of Life* (1912), which are the main expressions of his religious philosophy. In all Unamuno has published some thirty-five volumes, one of the latest of his writings being his introduction, in 1935, to the new edition of his novel *Niebla* (Mist). Only a few of his works have been translated into English: *Don Quixote*, *The Tragic Sense of Life*, a selection from his writings translated and chosen by Mr. Crawford Flitch which are an excellent crystallization of his thought, and the novel *Mist*. The versatility and wide range of Unamuno's creative powers cannot be fully appreciated by reading his translated books alone, though they constitute the profoundest and most philosophical part of his literary output.

The strong independence of thought and originality revealed in his books come to the fore in the incidents of Unamuno's life. In 1923 he protested against the Directorate of Primo de Rivera and in February 1924 was exiled to Fuenteventura in the Canaries. He took with him two books: the Greek New Testament and the poetical works of Giacomo Leopardi, the prophet of futility and weariness whose philosophy was so utterly different from his own healthy outlook on life. The author of *Amore e Morte* (*Love and Death*) and *A Se Stesso* (*To Himself*) believing that life is no more than bitterness and tedium and the world mud ('*Amaro e noia la vita, altro mai nulla; e fango é il mundo*'), and having no desire but to be shipwrecked in the infinite silence of death, has little to give to the passionate believer in man's hunger for immortality and his persistent desire for self-perpetuation. Perhaps Unamuno read Leopardi as a challenge to his own vigorous faith, as a stimulus to it; certainly not because of any temperamental affinity, for no man could be more different from the robust, 'flesh and bone' Professor of Salamanca than the morbid, introspective, self-pitying Italian romantic. Even his guards saluted him as he walked by, and the inhabitants of the little island must have benefited far more from his exile than he lost by it. A project for rescuing him (surely an exploit in the conquistadorian style!) was forestalled by an amnesty, and

Unamuno went into voluntary exile until the fall of Primo de Rivera's Dictatorship. Though a Liberal and a Republican, his sympathies turned to Franco in 1936, for he was disgusted by five years of political incompetence, mob-rule, and anti-religious agitation, church-burning, and persecution. They soon changed, however, for he repented of his welcome to the Fascists shortly before his death on hearing their jack-boots tramp up and down the Plaza Mayor of his beloved Salamanca.

Unamuno must have been a picturesque character, as virile in body as in mind. Mr. Crawford Flitch describes his indifference to cold and rain, his lively unconventional behaviour, his habit of dragging with him into the cold Spanish winter weather his colleagues and friends who were muffled up to the chin while he, their leader on these country walks, remained clad as though for a summer outing. A great talker, he dominated any group in conversation and thoughts flowed from his lips as they do on paper from his pen. He had little patience with academic isolation, loved to meet all kinds of people, and was at home with them all. In his own phrase, he was 'nothing less than a whole man.'

Contributions and Comments.

A Note on the Word σιώπησις: Canticles iv. 1, 3; vi. 6.

THE word *σιώπησις* in the above passages is rightly interpreted *veil*, and the same Hebrew word is translated, in what seems to be its only occurrence elsewhere, in the LXX by *κατακάλυμμα* (Is 47^2). Now it occurs to me that such a sense may throw some light on that difficult word *ἐξουσία* in 1 Co 11^{10}, viz. the 'authority' which the wearing of a veil gives the woman. So Œcumenius, *κάλυμμα, ἵνα φαίνηται ὅτι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν τυγχάνει*: and Theophylact explains *ἐξουσίαν* by *τοῦ ἐξουσιάζεσθαι σύμβολον—τουτέστι τὸ κάλυμμα*. Is it just possible that *ἑτοιμασία* in Eph 6^{15} may have something of a similar history? *I.e.* 'Your feet shod with the firm footing of the gospel of peace,' like soldiers in their heavy boots (caligae) spiked for that purpose.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

Winchester.

The Sower.

THE Parable of the Sower (Mk 4^{1-9} and par.) is provided with an elaborate allegorical explanation (Mk 4^{13-20} and par.). It has frequently been remarked, however, that the Sower himself is not identified, and in Luke's version of the allegory, which is considerably modified by ecclesiastical terminology, he is not even mentioned. Hence *ὁ σπείρων* is often explained as the particular Sower of the parable or a representative of his class, *i.e.* 'any farmer,' corresponding to 'any preacher of the gospel' in the allegory. Or it is suggested that the Sower is Jesus Himself reflecting on His own work in Galilee with its mixture of failure and success.

It is well known that the whole allegorical method of interpretation has been called into question. According to one view the allegory must be entirely forgotten; the parable is to be taken as it stands, the story of a farmer's fortunes (C. H. Dodd, *Parables of the Kingdom*, 182). Even so it is legitimate to ask whether Jesus had a special motive for choosing the picture of a man sowing. Is it sufficient to say that Jesus was familiar with a farmer's life and took a commonplace illustration to explain the coming of the Kingdom?

Some light is thrown on this by examining the Old Testament, where sowing is frequently mentioned (i) in a perfectly ordinary sense, and (ii) in a metaphorical sense of sowing righteousness or evil. The root ZR' in both senses is translated by *σπειρειν* in the LXX. Representing some other root *σπειρειν* is also used in the sense of 'scattering.' Now in four prophetic passages it is said that God Himself sows:

(*a*) Hos 2^{23} . 'I will sow her unto me in the earth; and I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy,' with a play on the meaning of Jezreel ('whom God sows'), cf. $1^{4, 11}$.

(*b*) Jer 31^{27} . 'Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will sow the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of man, and with the seed of beast.'

(*c*) Ezk 36^9 . 'For, behold, I am for you, and I will turn unto you, and ye shall be tilled and sown.'

(*d*) Zech 10^9 . 'And I will sow them among the peoples; and they shall remember me in far countries; and they shall live with their children, and shall return' (unless this be translated with RVm., 'And though I sow them . . . they shall remember . . .' where ZR' would stand for ZRH—but the meaning is somewhat less natural in view of the rest of the oracle).

All four passages are promises of the New Age envisaged by the prophets. God also appears as one who sows in 2(4) Esdras which may well incorporate material from the time of Our Lord: 'For, behold, I sow my law in you, and it shall bring forth fruit in you, and ye shall be glorified

in it for ever' (9^{31}, cf. 8^{6}). The Law is here parallel to the logos in the Parable of the Sower.

Thus it may be suggested that the Sower was chosen by Jesus because it was a recognized metaphor for God's action in bringing about the New Age.

The same metaphor occurs in three other parables: the Wheat and Tares, the Self-growing Seed, and the Mustard Seed (Q form). It is suggested that the above conclusion is true for these parables also. The Mustard Seed has already a direct connexion with the divine activity in bringing about the New Age by its relation to Ezk $17^{22f.}$. In the allegorical interpretation of the Wheat and Tares (Mt $13^{36ff.}$) the Sower is identified as the Son of Man; in view of the Old Testament passages cited this identification seems more than ever to be secondary.

K. Grayston.

R.O.F. Chaplain.

Entre Nous.

Sidney Dark.

Since he retired from the Editor's chair of 'The Church Times' Mr. Sidney Dark has been devoting a large part of his energy to the production of books in which he continues to comment fearlessly, and most entertainingly, on the most discussed questions of our time. He is always outspoken and independent, and his latest volume, *I Sit and I Think and I Wonder* (Gollancz; 8s. 6d. net), is no exception. His general position is well known by this time. He calls himself an 'obstinate believer,' his sympathies are pronouncedly Anglo-Catholic, and he has no doubt at all that the Church should take a firmly Socialist stand in politics. 'I am a Socialist because I am a Christian.' He is unwearying in his propaganda for the Malvern Movement, for 'a radical re-arrangement of social conditions in the name of the Lord.' 'As I see it, it is the duty of the Christian priest, who understands and accepts all the implications of Malvern, to demand from his pulpit (and again in the name of the Lord) the nationalization of the banks, the land, and the mines, because the private ownership of these essentials has been proved to contrive misery and frustration for the men, women, and children for whom Christ died.'

If sometimes Mr. Dark appears too forthright, and if the Church's duty may not appear to all quite so clear as he sees it to be, no one can question his deep concern for the welfare of the Church, or fail to see how passionately eager he is to see the swift bridging of the gulf which separates the Church from the masses. He is a crusader, dauntless and unafraid, always exhibiting grace and charm, so that even when one differs most violently, as, for example, in his strictures on Puritanism, which he has never taken the trouble to understand, one remains conscious of the debt which the whole Christian community should feel to be owing to such a gay and sprightly defender of the faith.

If his sympathies are Anglo-Catholic, he can at the same time produce for the chastisement of his friends an occasional whip, sometimes even a scorpion. 'In my years of office I grew more and more weary of the emphasis on ecclesiastical *minutiae* and of the hard particularism which implied, "in this way only can men be saved," which I never for a moment believed.' 'Among what were called the Catholic-minded clergy there was a very limited acceptance of Bishop Weston's declaration that it is useless to worship Jesus in the Tabernacle unless you are ready to minister to Jesus in the slums.' And he pleads for a greater drawing together of all Christians.

But the reader will find, in addition, lively and incisive comment on the Roman Catholic Church, which he profoundly distrusts. 'The facts are that, while Roman Catholics in England are a comparatively small body, at least three-quarters of them Irish, they exercise an influence in key places out of all proportion to their numbers, and this is particularly true of the Foreign Office and the Press.' 'It is not the rank and file of the Roman Catholic community that counts at all; it is the small body of astute men with a definite political and social philosophy and with a genius for pulling the strings behind those scenes where the pulling can be most effective. These are the people whom I fear.'

His pen touches many subjects, always with insight and understanding, and the greater leisure which he now enjoys should enable us to profit still more in the future from his unique experience of men and affairs. A certain carelessness in proof-reading, apparent in former books, is noticeable here again. *Van Wyck Brooks* appears as *Van Wyck Brown* on pages 7, 10, and 12, three times within a few pages. His identity is restored later on.

R. J. Wedderspoon.

Glasgow.

Fredrik Ramm.

'Fredrik Ramm was perhaps the best-known journalist in Norway. While still quite a young man he accompanied Amundsen as sole Press representative on his flight over the North Pole. His story was headlined in the newspapers of the world. Last month, shortly after release from a German prison, he died at Odense in Denmark, a martyr for loyalty to his country and his God.

'Not always had such a spirit possessed him. In his youth a sceptical materialism had drawn him away from the Church and God. His political creed had been "My country right or wrong." Hatred and resentment poisoned his powerful writing and he greatly embittered relations be-

tween Norway and Denmark during and after the Greenland dispute.

'And then, as he himself, half joking and wholly serious, once put it, "The greatest miracle of modern times happened—I was changed."

'As he listened quietly to God's voice, he saw that he must make amends for the wrong he had done to Denmark. He travelled across the Sound and made public apology in the Press and over the wireless for what his earlier hatred had led him to do. From that time onwards he worked tirelessly for unity within his nation and with all her neighbours.

'Such a man, with strong moral convictions and a national following, was naturally recognized by the Nazis and Quislings as embodying all that they most desired to crush. In a great series of articles he rallied his countrymen and became a spearhead of Norwegian resistance. He was sentenced without trial to fifteen years' imprisonment, and confined in the area of the Hamburg docks.

'His prison letters, one of which he was allowed to write every three months, show how his faith upheld him in this final ordeal.

'"I go to bed each night thanking God for all that He has given me during the day of joy, freedom, and hope; and I can in truth say that my moments of depression are few, and are becoming fewer and shorter the longer I am here. My great and daily experience is what God is doing for me; I can say this, that I thank Him with my whole heart for all that He has allowed to happen to me, for in everything I perceive His greatness, plan, and love. And for that reason all bitterness, all hate is cleaned out of my soul, and I know love and sympathy only. May God keep it so!"

'But strong man though he was, his physical frame broke under the strain. Early this year he developed tuberculosis. He was offered better conditions if he would agree to make German munitions. He refused, well knowing that this was virtually signing his own death sentence. He was at once given harsher treatment and released from prison only when pneumonia had set in and it was clear that he would die. He started for home, but never saw Norway again.'[1]

'The Searchlights.'

There is something very English and sincere about Mr. Wilfrid Gibson's work and in his latest book of poems, *The Searchlights* (Milford; 9s. net), this quality is as marked as ever. Here we have one of the few poets who sang in the last war, and still now sings, his quiet simple songs. We can, as we read, constantly fancy we hear him saying to himself that he is not going to let his imagination run away with him. No, he will take the wild creature by the horns, and hold her face to the plain earth. This is a volume of contemporary narrative or pictorial verse which relies upon the stark undecorated facts it uses to prepare the mind for the poetic shock: Wordsworth, Maurice Hewlett, Masefield, all had the same confidence in the power of bare simplicity. Is it possible that the very woodenness and stiffness of the versification is part of the poet's cunning technique? There can be no other excuse for it. And not till he has firmly planted our feet on this completely prosaic, and at the same time cruel and tragic land, does Mr. Gibson direct another subtler ray upon the picture, which pierces within to the soul, and stirs up memory, emotion, hope. The crude, naif, battered little puppets of Fate begin to dream and to remember, and we know that they are divine.

'O you innocent victims,' the poet seems to ask, 'of this our tragic day, tell us, dying soldier, drowning sailor, parent bereft, parted lover, broken airman, blitzed and bewildered people, what has been harmed in all of you, and what remains?'

And out of Gibson's quiet, traditional workshop they return to us, solid, undestroyed; pulsating elements of Nature, children of light. We have only space for one of the shorter poems, but it is a fair illustration of the poet's style and method.

THE WATERLILY.

He had best not think of it, but keep his brain
From reckoning the risks. So, as the train
Moves cautiously towards the front, sand-blind,
Across the desert, he recalls to mind
The quietest of memories: and again
Under boughs lustred with fresh fallen rain
He stands beside the still mid-forest pool
And looks into the leaf-reflecting cool
Green lucency on which a lily lies,
The first to open; while two dragon flies
With emerald glitter in the early light
Flicker above it in a dizzy flight,
Whose restlessness, in its rapidity,
The flower's pellucid immobility
Had seemed to render even more intense.
And as, in dream, he drinks through every sense
Tranquillity from the lily's light-filled bowl
Of alabaster petals, his troubled soul
Recovers itself; and he regards again,
Unmoved, the destination of the train.

The value, for the Christian teacher, of this book, is that it reveals 'unconverted man,' as simple, child-like, and in harmony with the unseen realities. Up to a point yes. But here is no faith in the personal nature of that mystery which lies behind our little lives. 'I' has not yet whispered 'Thou.' How deep a gulf is still to be crossed, and yet how near are these tender sorrowing ones to the Kingdom of Heaven.

EDITH ANNE ROBERTSON.

Aberdeen.

---

[1] J. P. Thornton-Duesbery, in *The Record*, 17th December, 1943.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.